

An ACCURATE
EXAMINATION
OF THE
Principal Texts

Usually alledged for
The Divinity of our Saviour;

AND
For the Satisfaction by him made to the
Justice of God, for the Sins of Men:

Occasioned by a BOOK of Mr. L. Milbourn,
CALLED,

Mysteries (in Religion) vindicated.

[By Stephen Nye]

London, Printed in the Year, 1692.

EXAMINATION

Principal Topics

1. The Constitution of the State of New York

2. The Powers and Duties of the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Government

3. The Rights and Liberties of the People

4. The History and Geography of the State

5. The Principles of Agriculture and Commerce

THE
P R E F A C E

TO

Mr. L. MILBOURN.

S I R,

I Began to read your Book, with very close attention and regard; but when I had gone over some part of it, I perceived you were not so qualified, that you might (reasonably) undertake to intermeddle in these Questions, or deserve to be heard concerning them. If, in defect of other necessary Endowments of a Writer, you please your self however in the bulkiness of your Book; you may be advised for the time to come, that on the contrary, every Trifle is so much the better, by how much the shorter it is; and that a verbose Trifler is nauseous even to Friends.

In your Dedication you say, the Bishops ought to use a just Severity against, and to frown effectually upon such, whom the late Act of Toleration excludes from all Benefit thereby: that is, they ought to fall to persecuting the Socinians, for the (supposed) Errors of their Conscience.

Truly (Sir) we are beholden to you. But what if the Socinians, against whom you publickly excite the Bishops, should write the Farce of your Life? They know very well the several Scenes of it, and the Part you have acted at Pembr. Hall, at London, and afterwards at Yarmouth, from whence 'tis said you ran away: Are you not aware, that it were easy for them to make you a Town-talk; as you have made your self a Country-talk, and at best withdrew your self? Your Preface has two Parts; The First is an Apology for your Book; the other is taken up in complementing T. F.

I will speak briefly to both.

I. That you have said but a little in a great deal, that the Parts of your Book are ill put together, that you have been impertinent in diverting to Matters, that were beside your Text and Undertaking; all these you confess: but you excuse the Meanness

of your Performance by your Poverty, and your Poverty you lay to the Charge of the People of Yarmouth; who could not, you say, be made sensible of your Learning and Worth; that is the meaning of what you have said at Pag. 1. of your Preface.

But such as know Yarmouth, how populous and wealthy it is, will not be perswaded out of it, but that a Person of no more Learning or Parts than L. M. were he withal but Modest, Peaceable, and Exemplary, might live at Yarmouth in quality of their Minister, very handsomely and comfortably, and besides be esteem'd and belov'd. They tell us, that seeing your Sermons against us, have been so little liked at their Majesty's good Town of Yarmouth; we ought to make trial, how that discerning People will entertain our Pamphlets; they have already refused the Evil, there is therefore reasonable hope, that they will chuse the Good, and will rejoice in it.

The second Part of your Preface is all Complement on T. F. Thus you begin, calling him, pert Smatterer in Ignorance: so says the Reverend Mr. L. M. and this was the best he could say, when he undertook to give a Character of T. F.

But I find that the most Reverend are in a very different Story concerning this Gentleman: The Metropolitan of all England, thought fit to say of him, That Worthy and Useful Citizen, Mr. T. F. Fun. Ser-

mon on Mr. Gouge, p. 63. What may be the Reason that T. F. is drawn in such different Colours? I think 'tis not hard to find the Reason: Some, because they heartily love God, and reverence Virtue and Well-doing, can think and speak respectfully, even of those from whom they differ very widely in their Sentiments about the controverted Points of Christianity: for God's sake they can cordially smile upon a good Man, though they think him in an Error; and they are of Opinion, because the Holy Scriptures have said it, that fervent Charity is greater than Faith. But others, measuring all Persons and Things, by only the narrow Interests of themselves and their Party, and wholly excluding God, and the relation to him, rail against their Adversaries, giving all Men to the Devil that are of a Belief contrary to theirs. Which brings to mind what Mr. Calvin has observed: *Ut quisq; eorum pro ventre est maxime sollicitus, ita pro fide sua deprebenditur Bellator acerrimus: i. e.* As any of them are more concerned, and afraid for their Belies; so he is found to bawl and rail loudest, on behalf of his own particular Faith and Party. *Calvi. Pref. ad Institut. p. 7.*

Well, but what might be the very meaning of this Witticism on T. F. pert Smatterer in Ignorance? I suppose the meaning is, T. F. has had his Education at London, not at Cambridge or Oxford; he knows nothing of

of Predicables, Predicaments and Syllogisms; nor has ever learned there to drink the third or fourth Bottle for his own share. What an unhappy Education was this, that his Friends took no care to make him a Fool and a Debauch; that the Gifts and Impressions of God and Nature, have not been effaced by a sort of Institution, which sometimes to make a Scholar, defaces both the Man and the Christian? T. F. has only Reason and good Sense; how unlucky was it, that he should not destroy them by Logick and Metaphysicks? However, I am of Opinion, T. F. will make his natural Talents go as far, and do him as much Service and Credit, as Logick and Metaphysicks, and skill of the Bottle, will do for L. M. or for his Cause.

The next Charge upon him, is in these words; The Socinians Hawker, to disperse their new-fangled Divinity. Hawker! of all Men living, L. M. should have forbore this word Hawker; unless he has forgot, because 'tis a good while since, how unluckily the banking off Books succeeded with himself, in a certain place which at present I forbear to name. See, Sir, we can be affronted and abused, without making haste to revenge our selves.

But why is our Divinity new-fangled? It hath two such Marks of Antiquity, by confession of our very Opposers, that could they show either of them for their Divinity, we would make little difficulty of coming over to their Party. For, first, 'tis acknow-

ledged by the most Learned of our Opposers, that the Patriarchal Ages, and the Church of the Old Testament, never knew the Doctrine of the Trinity: We are confess'd (by our Adversaries) to believe concerning God, as the Patriarchs and Prophets believed; namely, that there is but one who is God, or that God is but one Person. Secondly, The Apostles Creed, the only Monument of true Antiquity, besides the Bible, which the Christian Church has, is owned (too) to be wholly Unitarian; for it gives the Appellation God, to only the Almighty Father, Maker of Heaven and Earth: and speaks of our Saviour under no other Characters, but those of a Man, describing his Conception or Generation (by the Holy Ghost, or Power of God) in the Womb of Holy Mary, declaring that he died, was buried, rose again, and was exalted to the right Hand of God, that is, to be next unto God; all which is a denying him to be God. It says no more of the Holy Ghost, than it says of the Holy Catholick Church: I believe in the Holy Ghost, I believe in the Holy Catholick Church; so (all know) this Creed is read in the Original Greek.

Your last sting at T. F. is to this purpose, tho after a scurrilous fashion; that the Socinians have made choice of him, to disperse their Pamphlets; That a Person so much concerned and imployed in the disposal of Charity, might keep the Ballance even, between Heaven and Hell; and while he supports Mens Bodies,

dies, might pervert and poison their Souls.

'Tis well, Sir; but what will your Wisdomship advise in the case? Shall we turn this dangerous Man out of the gainful Employment of neglecting his own Business, and losing his Time, to be an Instrument of Good to the Poor and Necessitous? And let me ask you this Question, Do you really think, that this Gentleman ever endeavoured to profess to his particular Persuasion any of the Objects of Charity, with whom he is concerned? Does he, think you, seek to gather a Church out of the Hospitals, the Prisons, the Corners of Streets, or of such Persons as are ready to perish for want of Bread or Clothes? If you your self do not so think, as you are challenged, to give but one single Instance of what you would insinuate: to your Head you are an ill Man, to make that the subject of your Scurrility, which should have been of your Praises and Commendations. Doth the Age, Sir, so abound with Men, who make it any part of their business to minister to the Wants of others, that it should be advisable to discourage such Persons, by false and scandalous Innuendo's? But I am with-held by a particular Charge, as I am told, from him, from doing him that Right against your Reproaches, which I thought to be due to his Exemplary Industry, and particular Dexterity in soliciting and managing the Cause and Interests of the Poor: He saith, if what he doth

in that matter will not defend it self, he is content to be without a Defence.

You conclude with submitting ALL that you have written to the Censure and Correction of Holy Mother-Church.

I acknowledg the Language of Babylon; but was it convenient, that a Presbyter of the Church of England (as you write your self) should thus publish to the whole World, that he has neither Faith nor Religion; I mean of his own, but only what Mother-Church shall prescribe to him, as the terms of Preference? He propounds here in a Book of 800 Pages, the Doctrines of the Trinity and the Satisfaction, as Essential Articles of the Christian Religion; and such as must be believed, or (if you'll believe him) you shall without doubt perish everlastingly: He pretends he has proved these Doctrines by Demonstrations of Reason, and by Testimonies of Holy Scripture, and of all Antiquity: Well, does he himself believe what he has written? Not a Tittle of it, he says, unless Mother-Church approves of it; he submits ALL, Faith and Proofs, to the Censure and Correction of his Holy Mother; let her hang or save, he submits.

This is the Man with whom we have to deal, without Faith and without Conscience, unless as the Church directs; nay, and he dares profess too, to be otherwise without either. Neither is L. M. alone, but there are many others that believe their Paradoxes

no more than we do, but they subdue first their Consciences, and afterwards their Minds to the Sophistries usually alledged to prove them, so long as Holy Mother Church (which can dispose of their Fortunes in the World) recommends this Belief as the condition of holding a Parsonage or Vicarage, or of getting a Deanary or Prebend. On the same Conditions Mother Shipton should be as sacred and infallible with them as Mother Church; and they would believe the Kingdom of Oberon, and the Territories of Fairy-Land: and had they been born Papists, Transubstantiation should have been reckoned among the holy Mysteries, which Faith must embrace, tho Reason (craz'd they say, since the Fall of Adam) disclaims and renounces them.

But who is Holy Mother-Church to whom they pay such Profound Submissions? I meet with her in Story some hundreds of Years past; she seems to be such a one as the Scots imagin'd Queen Elizabeth to be: I mean, as uncertain and vivacious. The Scots thought their King should never succeed to the Crown of England; for Queen Elizabeth, say they, is not a particular Woman: But the Lords of the Council in England call an old Woman Queen Elizabeth; and so long as there is an old Woman in England, they will never want a Queen Elizabeth.

But the worst thing, to my Fancy, in Holy Mother-Church, is this, that she is such an Individuum Vagum; in

one place she is this thing, in another she is the just contrary: she is not the same in England (for instance) that she is at Rome, or at Geneva, or in Germany, and the two Northern Kingdoms, or in the Provinces of the Levant; in all these places she is so different a Person, that she mortally hates and furiously persecutes her own self.

I find just such another Fantasm haunting the chosen Nation, as is now meant by Mother-Church; and it was in as much regard with two sorts of People, the Designing and the Weak, as Mother-Church is now with the like sorts of Men and Women. Jer. 7.4. Trust not in vain words, saying, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord, The Temple of the Lord are these. By which they intended what some now do, when they say Mother-Church, Mother-Church, Mother-Church; but the Prophet ventures to call them vain words, i. e. a lying and unprofitable Pretence.

But after all that Reverence which any pretend to have for this Holy Mother: 'tis certain there is nothing really meant by our Holy Mother the Church, but only the strongest side, or the prevailing Party. And all the mighty Complements Men use to this blessed Mother, are nothing else but their Wit or their Fears. They find themselves the Slaves of an usurping Faction in the Church, which is able to constrain them to profess any thing, tho never

so contradictory and absurd : therefore the Witty presently list themselves of the Party, call themselves her Sons and Children and subscribe and swear to all she propounds. In others, their Dread and Awe turns into real Reverence, or rather Superstition ; and they act and believe as they are commanded, without desiring or caring to reflect upon the Causes which first bialled their Minds to this Obedience ; but those Causes were originally nothing else, but the Power and Wealth of the Holy Mother, that is (as was said) of the strongest side.

But there is another sort of People, called Schismatics and Hereticks, who having free and discerning Minds, stout and brave Souls, finding themselves (in some Particulars) either cheated or wronged by the strongest side ; they maintain, tho a dangerous and hazardous, yet a generous and perpetual War, for the Natural Liberties of Mankind in Matters of Conscience and Religion. They assert by all possible (and honest) means, the King-

dom of God ; that is, they admit of no Lords over Conscience, but only God ; nor any Law of Faith, of Worship or Manners, but only God's Word ; no Canons or Articles, no humanly devised Creeds or Catechisms, nothing but God's Word, the naked Gospel, without any Interpretations or Interpreters, but only Reason and Good Sense. These have the luck sometimes to baffle Mother-Church, and to bear up against all her Indignation.

But this, Sir, shall serve in Answer to your Dedication and Preface ; only let me advise you, as you would come off with more Credit, and do more Good in the Parish of Great St. Hellens, than you did at Great Yarmouth, that you carry it with more Modesty and Respect to all the Inhabitants, and to forbear such smutty Lampoons as you made upon that Town. What follows is an Answer to your Book, and I address it to Friend T: F.

An Accurate EXAMINATION of the principal Texts,
usually alledged for the Divinity of our Saviour ; and
for the Satisfaction by him made to the Justice of
God, for the Sins of Men : Occasioned by a Book
of Mr. Luke Milbourn, called, *Mysteries (in Religion)*
Vindicated. To T. F.

[By Stephen Nye]

CHAP. I.

Containing an accurate Examination of 1 Tim. 3. 16.

S I R,

YOUR (particular) Friend
Mr. Milb. has begun his Attack
on Socinianism, with a Text of
St. Paul; in the Explication
and Vindication of which, he
wastes no fewer than 82 Pages: The Text
is this, *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, God*
was manifest in the Flesh, justified in the Spirit,
seen of Angels, preached unto the Gentiles, be-
lieved on in the World, receiving up into Glory.
1 Tim. 3. 16. He saith hereupon, that in-
deed some Translators read here, *Great is the*
Mystery of Godliness, WHICH (which My-
stery) *was manifested by Flesh*: that is, the
Law was given by Angels, but the Gospel by
the Ministry of Men, (even by Jesus Christ,
and his Apostles) called *Flesh* here, in op-
position to Angels who are *Spirit*; and be-
cause *Flesh* is the usual Scripture-Term for
Man: but all the *Greek Copies* (he saith)
agree in reading this Text, as we read it in
our English Bibles; as also does the famous

Manuscript in the King of England's Library,
which is about 1300 Years old.

And if (saith he) the Providence of
God, as the Socinians contend, is concerned
to preserve his own holy Word from Cor-
ruptions and Falsifications; 'tis reasonable
to think, such Providence has been exercised
rather about the *Original Greek*, than about
Translations. But neither, saith he, do all
the old Translations read here, as the Socin-
ians do; for the *Arabick* reads as we do,
GOD was manifested in the Flesh.

Furthermore, *Macdonius*, to whom the
Socinians impute the Corruption of this
Text, was too late in time; for he lived in
the Year 512. to attempt an Innovation in
Scripture: And besides, he could have no
design in so doing; because he had no *pre-*
vious Opinions about our Saviour.

Finally, the word *God* in the first Clause
of this Verse, makes that Clause to accord
with all that follow it; for all of them

B together

together will make this most proper Sense.
 " The Eternal Son of God, God equal with
 " his Father, and Creator of the World,
 " took upon him, and was manifested in our
 " weak and passible Nature, being incarnate
 " in the Man Christ Jesus: He was justified
 " to be God, notwithstanding his mean
 " outward Appearance, by divers glorious
 " Actions and Miracles, done on that be-
 " half by the Holy Spirit: He was seen (i. e.
 " known) by Angels, to be the Eternal
 " Son of God, and God, tho' covered with
 " the Veil of Flesh: He was preached as such,
 " by the Apostles to the Gentiles; was be-
 " lieved on generally in the World, where-
 " ever they came: and after his Resurrecti-
 " on He was received up into the Glories of
 " Heaven.

But if, saith our Author, we read here, as the Socinians do; *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, WHICH Mystery was manifested by Flesh*, that is, by Men; what Sense shall we make of the other Clauses? Will it be Sense to say, The Mystery of Godliness (the Gospel) was seen by Angels? Or will it be true, that it was received up into the Glory of Heaven? The Socinians indeed here answer, That instead of these words, *received up into Glory*, it should have been said by our Translators, *was gloriously extolled*, was magnified and lifted up: but this, saith our Author, is false; for on the contrary, the Gospel was despised and derided both by Jews and Gentiles.

This is the Sum and Force of what he has transcribed out of Authors, in behalf of his Opinion, from the words of this Text. He might, if he had pleased, have given us too the full and solid Answer, made by the Socinians, to these Pretences of his Parry: for I see, he has quoted the Books, in which those Answers are to be found: but that was not the way, he thought, to mend his Fortunes in the World; which is what he aims at, and the cause of his writing his Book.

I will (briefly) evince these two things.

1. This Text of St. Paul has been falsified

by those, who affirm the Ante-mundan Existence, and Divinity of our Saviour.
 2. This Corruption has been so unskillfully performed, that the Attempt serves, only to betray their Unfaithfulness and Partiality, but does not a whit avail their Cause.

1. This Text has been most certainly falsified, by substitution of the word *God*, instead of *Which*, *WHICH* (*Mystery*) *was manifested by Flesh*.

The first time I meet with this Text, read with the word *God*, among the Antients, is in the Acts of the first Council of Nice, a Council of next Authority to the Scriptures themselves, in the Opinion of our Opposers. In this Council, a Person repeated the words of St. Paul, as they are now read by Trinitarians; *God was manifested in Flesh*: the Person who made this Mistake, probably from some Marginal Note, where he found the word *God* put as an Explanation of the word *Which* in the Text, was answered by Macarius Bishop of Jerusalem; that he mistook the reading, for St. Paul's words are, *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, WHICH was manifested by Flesh*.

Mr. Milbourn will not say, that the Authors of the Old Translations, the Latin, Syriac and Armenian, were Unitarians; he sure St. Jerom (Author of the Latin) was a bigotted Trinitarian: yet they and he read with the Nicene Council, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh*, not *GOD was manifested in Flesh*. I appeal to any Man, of ordinary sense, whether he can think, those Translators and Fathers would have corrupted the Bible in favour, and to the advantage of their Adversaries the Unitarians, by saying (not *GOD*, but) *WHICH* was manifested by Flesh: and whether their so translating (*WHICH was manifested by Flesh*) be not a Demonstrative Proof, that the Greek Copies of those ancient Times did read, as the Socinians now do?

But he saith, the Arabic Version of Scripture is on his side. I am not now in a place, where I have many Books; and particularly none of the Polyglots; but I see, that

Grotius

Grotius and other Criticks (in Mr. *Pool's* Collection) do all allow, that the *Arabic* reads here, as the *Syriac* and *Latin* do, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh*. Therefore I suppose, that our Author makes use of a *Polyglot* that has been conformed (i. e. corrupted) by the Publishers, to the present Greek Editions: for not only the *Arabic*, but the *Syriac* and *Latin* have been so used in divers places, by later Publishers; as *Father Simon* often observes. Besides, the question is, concerning the *Old Translations*, made before Trinitarians were become absolute Masters of *Christendom*; such as the *Latin*, *Armenian* and *Syriac*: the *Arabic* is much later; all the *Arabic Versions* having been made, but only since the Conquest of the Eastern Provinces by the *Turks*. *F. Simon* Crit. Hist. on the Old Test. l. 2. c. 16. p. 109, &c.

'Tis by the Trinitarians themselves, that we are informed of divers Editions of the Greek Copies; in which the Publishers have corruptly, say they themselves, put *God* for *Which* in this Text. Thus *Grotius* (in lib.) cites *Hincmarus*, confessing, that the Nestorian Trinitarians corruptly substituted *God* for *Which* in these words of *St. Paul*; so much the better to defend themselves against the Eutychians. And *Liberatus* assures us, that *Macedonius* (Patriarch of *Constantinople*) was deposed in a Council summoned by the Emperor *Anastasius*, Anno 512. for publishing a Greek Edition of the Bible, in which he corrupted this Text, by causing all the Copiers to write *God* in the place of *Which*. Of these two Authors, *Hincmarus* was a Person of great Dignity, being Archbishop of *Rhemes*, and (by Confession of our Opposers) not only altogether Orthodox, but very Learned and Pious: the other, *Liberatus*, was Archdeacon of *Carthage*; and besides the Qualities of Orthodox and Learned, was also contemporary to the matter of which he writes, the Deposition of *Macedonius* for corrupting this Text.

What now does Mr. *Milbourn* oppose to these *Authentick Histories*? He opposes only two silly *Conjectures*. He saith, he doth not

think, *Macedonius* would attempt such a thing; because he had no peculiar Opinions of his own about our Saviour; and because he seems too late in Time, to hope reasonably that the Forgery could pass unobserved.

But does not Mr. *Milbourn* know, that this *Macedonius* was a Trinitarian? Do not all the Church-Historians call him *Orthodox*? And was not this cause enough, with an ill Man, as the Council judged him to be, to adventure on such an Undertaking? Nor was this Corruption so late in Time, but that it has been the cause, that many Publishers have followed his Copies; and his presence (without doubt) was, that he found the word *God* in the Margins of some Bibles, which he took to be a Correction, not an Explication (as indeed it was) of the word *Which* in the Body of the Text.

But here, Sir, you yourself will perhaps object, that these Corruptions being thus noted by Learned Men, and even by Councils, would not have been followed by all the Copiers and Publishers of the Bible: but we see, so Mr. *Milb.* says, that all the Greek Copies, especially the famous one in the King's Library (about 1300 Years old, and therefore older than *Macedonius*) read here, *GOD was manifested in the Flesh*.

To this, I say, I believe all the Greek Copies that Mr. *Milbourn* has seen, may so read; for he has seen ('tis likely) some one; but he ought to have consulted Learned Men, before he was so confident, that all (absolutely All) Greek Copies read as 'tis in his Book. *Erasmus*, somewhat learnerd than our Author, says, *Multa vetera exemplaria*, i. e. a great many of the ancient Copies read, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh*: and saith *Erasmus* further, *I approve of that reading*. Our Author may see these words of *Erasmus* in Mr. *Pool's* Collection of Criticks in *L.* And if Mr. *Milbourn* had look'd into the Margin of *Cursellanus* his most correct Edition of the Greek Testament, he would have seen there, that the ancient Greek Copies used by that Critick, read *WHICH*

was manifested by *Flesh*: and so also *Morinus*, another famous Critick, acknowledges.

I know not how old the Copy in the King's Library may be, Mr. *Milbourn* is positive, that 'tis about 1300 Years old, and older than *Macdonius*: when his hand was in, he might have said, 'tis now precisely 1592. Years old; and is the very Autographical Copy of St. *John* the Evangelist; he may say so, if he pleases; for the Book has no Date, nor any certain Circumstance, by which we may judge 'tis 1300 Years old, rather than 1000 or 1100, and therefore younger than *Macdonius*.

But our Author says, we cannot make *Sense* and *Truth* of the other Clauses in this Verse; if we read this governing Clause by, *WHICH was manifested by Flesh*; for how was this *Mystery* of the Gospel *seen by Angels*, and how was it *received up into Glory*?

He is a forward Man at censuring, but he should have had more Manners, when the Writers of Holy Scripture were concerned. We affirm, that St. *Paul* doth here say, the *Mystery* of the Gospel was *seen by Angels*: Why should not this be *Truth* and *Sense*; when another Apostle hath expressly told us, that the *Angels desire to look into it*? 1 Pet. 1. 12.

Instead of *received up into Glory*, he knows, that we translate by *was received gloriously*, was magnified, extolled, lifted up. But tho he dares not deny, that the original words are capable of this Translation, he finds fault with it as a false *Sense*; because (saith he) on the contrary, the Gospel was derided and despised, both by the Jews and Gentiles. We deny not, that wicked and interested Persons, both of the Jews and Gentiles, opposed the Gospel: but we certainly know, it was so received in most places, if not in all; that St. *Paul* had reason here to say, it was gloriously entertained and magnified. Himself tells us, that having preached the *Mystery* of the Gospel, to the Galatian Nation; they were so affected with it, that they would have given to him their very Eyes; Gal. 4. 15. St. *Luke* in his *Acts* of the Apo-

stles, witnesses that throughout all Asia, the Name of the Lord *Jesus* was magnified; Acts 19. 10, 17. As concerning the Jews, 'tis said of them, at Acts 21. 20. that many thousands (in the Greek 'tis many ten thousands) of them believed: and what is more marvellous, at Acts 6. 7. A great Company (even) of the Priests were obedient to the Faith.

Our Author therefore might have spared his false and impious Scurrility upon the Gospel, when he saith at Pag. 68. It was scorned and divided, both by Jews and Gentiles. Had he no way to defend his Cause, but by an Insult on the Gospel itself?

I know not, Sir, what stronger or clearer Proofs any Man can require, that this Text was anciently read, by *WHICH* (which *Mystery* of Godliness) was manifested by *Flesh*: i. e. by *Man*, as the Law had been by Angels? For you see, we have for this reading, first all the ancient Translations, the Latin, Armenian and Syriac; then the Council of *Nice*, so much extolled and revered by our Opposers: besides these, the Testimony of Trinitarian Historians, Men of Learning and Dignity, and contemporary to the Corruption of this Text; also a vast number of the best and oldest Copies of the Original Greek, and the Judgment of the ablest Criticks upon them.

If all this does not amount to a *Demonstration* on our side, in the Judgment of indifferent Persons; yet there is no Man of common Prudence and Caution, but will allow, that the reading for which our Adversaries contend, (*GOD was manifested in Flesh*) is too uncertain, doubtful and precarious, to build on it (as the Trinitarians do) an Article of Faith; or to innovate in the Doctrine of the Unity of God, dictated to us by Natural Light, and the principal Design of both the Testaments.

2. But supposing now this Point were yielded to them, that we are to read here, *GOD was manifested in (or by) Flesh*; it will nothing avail the Trinitarian Cause. For by *GOD* here we may understand, as in divers other Texts the Trinitarians themselves

selves do, not *the Person*, but *the Will* and Mind of God: this was manifested to us by Flesh, that is, by *Men*, by Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

'Tis true, our Translators render the words by, *was manifested IN Flesh*; but they will not deny, that they might have been rendered, *Manifested BY Flesh*: for themselves so interpret the Greek Participle, in the very next Clause of this Verse; *was justified IN the Spirit*; that is, say They, was justified (or Proved) by the Spirit, by Miracles done by the Spirit of God.

That the word *God* may be sometimes interpreted, not of *the Person*, but of *the Will* or Mind of God; is not denied by the Trinitarian Interpreters; nay themselves, as I said before, so interpret. Thus, for Example; when St. Paul saith, *Gal. 1. 10. Do I now persuade Men, or God?* Our Opposers interpret it, thus; Do I seek to persuade *Human Inventions*, the Devices and Figments of *Men*, or the very *Will and Commands of God*? The like on divers other Texts.

Therefore, Sir, if Mr. *Milb.* has prevailed with you, to read this first Clause by, *God was manifested*; you may for all that, abide in your Sentiment about the Unity of God; and interpret to him the whole Verse, after this manner.

"Without Controversy, Great and Glorious is the Mystery of Godliness, even the Gospel of the Blessed Jesus; for 'tis no less or other, than the Will and Nature of God manifested to us, by the Agreeable and suitable Ministry of *Men*, of *Flesh* and Blood like to our selves: not as the Law was, by the Amazing and Terrible appearance of Flaming Ministers, even the *Spirits* and Angels of Heaven. This *Will of God* (or this Revelation of his Nature and Will) has been justified (i. e. proved) by the Spirit; by Miracles done by the Spirit, Energy or Power of God: it has been *seen* and admired by Angels, who desire to look more accu-

"rately into this New Revelation, which (in part) supersedes the Revelation of the Divine Will that was delivered by them: it has been *Preached* to the Gentiles; and *Believed on* in the World. Did I say, it has been Believed on? it has not been *Barly* Believed, but received (generally speaking) *with great Honour and Glory*.

From P. 82. where our Author takes leave of this famous Text, to P. 309. He mortifies his Reader, with a long Impertinence, concerning the *Reasonableness* and *Usefulness* of Mysteries, in Religion: and that, 'twas Necessary the *Messias* should be the Son of God.

We are not concerned, in the Truth or Falshood of either of these Affirmations of our Author: be it, as He says; tho his Allegations (or any He can bring) prove neither of them; What are they to his Purpose?

If Mysteries are indeed so useful in Religion, as he contends they are; it will not follow from thence, that we must admit, as parts of our Religion, all the Mysteries that fanciful or ignorant Men have devised; much less that we are obliged, to let all the *Nonsense* and *Contradictions*, that Any may seek to impose on our Faith, pass for *Holy* and *Divine* Mysteries.

That 'twas *Necessary*, that the *Messias* should be *the Son of God*, I doubt very much; and I think, our Author has offer'd nothing in proof of it, that is Considerable or Material: but that *de Facto* it was so, that our Lord Christ was indeed the Son of God, the Socinians have always Granted and Affirmed; because he was begotten by the Divine Power on a pure Virgin.

Therefore overpassing so much useless Scribble of this Author, I come to his *second Particular* (as He calls it) at P. 309. That *the Blessed Jesus was so the Son of God, as to be God equal with his Father*; or, *was really and truly God, as well as real Man*.

CHAP. II.

THAT our Lord Jesus Christ was true God, Equal with his Father; our Author undertakes to prove, 1. From Texts of the Old Testament. 2. From Texts of the New Testament. 3. By the Actions and Miracles, done by the said our Lord Jesus. 4. From the Consent of the Primitive Church. 5. From the Common and (as he saith) *on every hand Approved* practice, of worshipping and praying to him.

*His Proofs from the Old Testament,
accurately examined.*

He alledges, First, the History of the Three Angels, who at *Gen. 18.* appeared to *Abraham*. One of these Angels is called *Jehovah*, both by *Abraham* and by the Historian; but the Name *Jehovah* (which our Translators render *LORD*) is, saith our Author, communicable only to God; and that this Angel was indeed God, appears farther by *Abraham's* calling him (at *V. 18.*) *the Judge of the whole Earth.*

He saith hereupon; that by this History we gain the Certainty, that our Saviour had a Being before he was born of the Virgin: and that the Title, Power and Acknowledgments, belonging to the True God, are given to Christ.

But all this while, Mr. *Milb.* you forget the one thing Necessary; even to prove to us that this Angel, or this *Jehovah*, is the same Person that afterwards (in Gospel-times) is called the Lord Jesus. When you evince that, your Allegation of this History, will indeed be a Proof of the *Pre-existence* of our Saviour: till then, we remain in that (seemingly) rational Belief, that his Mother was Older than He.

But neither can we grant to you, that this Angel was indeed God; because the Name *Jehovah* is given to him: for that

Name is bestowed (in Holy Scripture) on Angels, when they are appointed to represent the Person of God; as we shall (presently) see is confessed, by some of the principal Critics of the Trinitarians themselves, and all the Jewish Interpreters. Nay, the Name *Jehovah* is given to such *Placis* and *Things*, as well as Persons; as God has honoured with his Presence, or with his particular Favour and Protection. See the *Br. History of the Unitarians*, on *Jam. 23. 5, 6.* and on *Zech. 3. 2.*

But He observes, that the Angel here is called *the Judge of the whole Earth*; therefore He could be no other than God.

But, *first*, he might have noted too, that there is an Ambiguity in the Original Words; for they might have been rendered, *the Judge of a whole Land*: So that the Sense will be; Shall not He who is sent by God, to be the Judge of a whole Land, (*Sodom* and its Territory) be careful to do right; seeing otherways, such great numbers of People will receive extreme Damage and Injury?

Secondly, Allowing the ordinary Translation; there is no Necessity to understand these words, concerning the Angel, but of God himself; so as to make this sense: Wilt thou destroy the Righteous, with the Wicked? that be far from thee. Shall not the Judge of the whole Earth, on whose Errand thou comest, and whose Delegates thou art, do right?

And *finally*, if the words are meant of the Angel himself; He is called *the Judge of the whole Earth*, in the same regard that He is called *Jehovah*: even because he Represented *Jehovah* the Judge of the whole Earth.

The Author to the *Hebrews*, refers to *Abraham's* entertaining these Angels, in that Exhortation; *Heb. 13. 2.* *Forget not to entertain Strangers, for thereby some have entertained Angels.* How much more powerfully might

might this Holy Writer have recommended Hospitality to us; if He had been of Opinion (with our Author and his Party) that one of these Angels was God, or a Person of God? If he had so believed, would He have failed to say; *Forget not to entertain Strangers, for some thereby have entertained God himself?*

So much on this Text.

Next, He cites the History of the Angel that met Jacob at Peniel, Gen. 32. 24. An Angel met Jacob, wrestled with him, and was worsted by him; and when he would have left him, Jacob would not suffer him to be gone, till he had Blessed him. Our Author saith, this Angel was God; for He would not tell his Name, which Angels (he saith) do not use to refuse: and Jacob prayed him to Bless him: and, finally, Jacob called the place of their Congress, Peniel, or the Face of God; because I have seen (El) God, face to face, Gen. 32. 4.

I never before, I confess, saw this place alleged in this Cause: and our Author has left us to Divine, what he would infer from it. But I suppose his meaning is, as on the former Text; that it follows from hence, that our Lord Christ had a Being, before he was born of his Mother: and that the Titles and Acknowledgments, belonging to God, are given to the Lord Christ. Therefore I answer too, as before; that He has again forgot the main thing, even to prove, that this Angel was (in process of Time) incarnate, and called Jesus Christ; of which he says not a word: as if we ought to take that for granted, which is the chief thing in question. I say also farther; that our Author's Allegations are very far from proving, that this Angel was God. He is indeed here called *El*: but *El* is a word used in Holy Scripture, indifferently of God, of Angels and of Men; as the English word LORD is.

Yet we are willing, that *El* should be here rendered God: for some of the most learned Interpreters and Critics, of the

Trinitarian Perswasion, have ingenuously owned; that the Angel is here called God, because He represented God. So Menochius and Tirinus in Mr. Pool's Collection.

But should I grant to our Author; that this Angel was true God: He would gain nothing by that Concession. For this Concession between Jacob and the Angel, (as that between the Angel and Balaam, recorded Numb. 22. 22, &c.) was only Spiritual, or in Vision; not Corporal and in Reality: as besides the Jewish Interpreters, is owned by St. Jerom, the Interlinear Gloss, by St. Thomas and Rupertus.

Jacob had this Vision to comfort and animate him, and to assure him of God's Presence with him; when He should meet with his Brother Esau: but that He might know, the Vision was really from God; he was made to Halt on that Leg, which in the Vision had been touched by the Angel. This Interpretation is Rational; because a Man could not really have prevailed, as the History says Jacob did, against an Angel; much less (as our Author so oddly, that I say no worse, supposes) against God.

His Third place, out of the Old Testament, is; Psal. 45. 6, 7. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.* He noteth, that these remarkable Words are applied to our Saviour, by the Author of the Hebrews, Heb. 1. 8, 9. *To the Son, He saith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.*

The Author of the Brief History of the Unitarians, answers, in short; that the words both in the Hebrew and the Greek, both in the Psalm and in the Epistle, might have been rendered, and interpreted after this manner: God is thy Throne (i.e. thy Seat, resting Place, or thy Establishment) for ever and ever. And so it is, that the illustrious Grotius Translates, and understands both these Texts.

But let us allow the Translation in our English Bibles, *Thy Throne (O God) is for ever and ever.* For understanding this Passage, and indeed the whole Psalm; some

Learned

Learned Interpreters have well noted, that this Psalm is an Epithalamium, or Marriage-Song to Solomon and Sulamitis Daughter of Pharaoh. It was sung by the Bride-Maids, saith Grotius, *In honorem novi mariti Solomonis, & novæ Nuptiæ Filie Regis Ægypti*; In Gratulation to the Bridegroom and Bride, Solomon and the Daughter of Pharaoh. Dr. Patrick says, that most Interpreters conclude, this Psalm was composed on occasion of the Marriage of Solomon with Pharaoh's Daughter.

Any one that reads the Psalm without Prejudice, will plainly see, that the Interpreters, of whom Dr. Patrick speaks, and whom he confesses to be the most, have rightly conjectured concerning this Psalm; namely, that 'tis a Marriage-Song to Solomon and his Egyptian Bride. It begins, *I will speak of (or I will rehearse) the things which I have made concerning the King*. Then the Poet proceeds to describe, and wish well to the King: *Thou art fairer than the Children of Men, Grace is poured on thy Lips; thy Garments smell of Myrrh, Aloes and Cassia, out of the Ivory Palaces, or Boxes*. He adds, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*; i. e. Thou sittest on the Throne of David, which is to endure for ever; for some descended from him (so God has promised) shall sit thereon, till it comes to the Messiah, or Christ; whose Kingdom shall be not only universal, as to place, but shall last for ever and ever. After these things said to Solomon, the Poem addresses to the Queen, *Hear, O Daughter, forget thy own People and thy Father's House, so shall the King greatly desire thy Beauty. Instead of thy Fathers, shall be thy Children; whom thou mayst make Princes in all the Earth, or rather in all this Land: q. d. Thou mayst make them Governours of Tribes in all the Land of Canaan*.

Our Opposers catch at the word *God*; *thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*: as if because of that word, it were necessary to suppose, that both the Psalmist and the Author to the Hebrews do speak of such a Person, as is really and truly God. But

why have they not noted, what our Saviour tells them, that those also are called *Gods* in Scripture, *To whom the Word of God comes*, Joh. 10. 35. that is to say, Judges, Magistrates, and especially Princes are called *Gods*, because they hold the Place of God, and act by his general Commission granted to them in his Word. For Proof of which Observation, he alleges the words of *Psal. 82. 6. concerning the Magistracy and Princes of Israel, I have said, Ye are Gods*. In a word, Solomon is in this Psalm saluted by the Name of *God*, according to the known Language of those Times and Countries, to Magistrates and Princes: and what had been said to Solomon, is by St. Paul to the Hebrews, applied or accommodated to the Great (Spiritual) King, the Messiah or Christ; because it might (even) more properly be said of him than of Solomon, even this saying, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*. Nay, we may allow, that he more than applies the words; we may say, he interprets them of Christ; because the Psalm being composed by a Prophetical Poet, at the same time that he courted and praised Solomon, he might prophesy of the Lord Christ. This account of these words, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever*, being so generally approved by the more learned Critics of the Trinitarians; I cannot but wonder, that this Text should be urged by any at this time of the day, as a Proof that the Lord Christ is true God, equal to the Eternal and Almighty Father of all, the dread Creator of Heaven and Earth. If it proves the Lord Christ to be such, it proves the same of Solomon, even in the Opinion of the most judicious of our Opposers.

A fourth Proof of our Author, is, *Ab. 1. 6. When he (God) bringeth his First-begotten into the World, he saith, (or he commandeth) Let all the Angels of God worship him*. His Argument from hence, is this, the Charge so often repeated in Scripture, of worshipping God only, obliges Angels as well as Men: seeing therefore they are required to worship

worship our Lord Christ, it follows that he is true God.

But our Author is greatly mistaken, when he saith, that the words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, are taken from *Psalm 97*. they are taken from the LXX Translation of *Deut. 32. 43.* where the LXX (whose Translation is followed generally by the Writers of the New Testament, and more especially by the Author of this Epistle throughout) read *Προσκυνήτωσαν αὐτῷ ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ*, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*; the very words of the Author to the Hebrews. But at *Psalm 97. 7.* from whence Mr. Milbourn would fetch this Quotation, 'tis only said, *Worship him all ye Gods*; and the words are by Interpreters commonly understood of the Gods or Demons worshipp'd by the Heathen Nations. Furthermore, it has been observed by some Trinitarian Critics, that *Justin Martyr, Theodoret, Epiphanius, and St. Austin* (all very ancient) quote these words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, as taken from the LXX Translation of *Deut. 32. 43.* tho the words are wanting in the present Hebrew Copies of the Bible, and therefore also in our English Bibles, as are divers other Passages of the Old Testament, cited by the Writers of the New.

The words in that Text of *Deuteronomy*, are spoken of the Nation of *Israel*; the Nations are there bid to rejoice with, and the Angels to worship *Israel*; that is, to guard, serve and watch over him. But these words intended originally of *Israel*, are, by the Author to the Hebrews, accommodated and applied likewise to the Lord Christ; because the Angels had in charge to succour and minister to him also. Yet not to him only, but to all his Brethren, *Heb. 1. 14. They are all Ministering Spirits, sent forth to minister to such as shall be heirs of Salvation.*

We have just such another Accommodation, or Application of a Text to our Saviour, which was originally meant of the Nation of *Israel*, at *Matth. 2. 15.* there the Evangelist saith, that Jesus was brought by

Joseph (his Foster-Father) out of *Egypt*, into *Judah*; and so, saith he, was fulfilled the Word of God by the Prophet, *Out of Egypt I have called my Son.* But any one that looks into the Context of the Prophet, will plainly see, that those words were originally meant and designed of the People of *Israel*, whom God there vouchsafes to call his Son. The words of the Prophet are these, *Hosea 11. 1. When Israel was a Child, (i. e. In the first Ages of that People) then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.*

Therefore when such Texts are either interpreted of Christ, or accommodated and applied to him, we are to understand it after this manner; that those Texts were again fulfilled, or had a second Completion in the Person of our Lord Christ.

But our Author urges, that the Precept of worshipping only God, obliges Angels and Men; therefore how could the Angels be required to worship Christ, if he were not true God?

It seems then, he has not observed what is said at *1 Chron. 29. 20. The Congregation blessed the Lord God of their Fathers; and bowing the Head, they worshipped the Lord and the King.* Nor has he noted, how often divers Persons worshipp'd our Saviour while he was upon Earth. The meaning is, not, that they worshipp'd either *David* or our Saviour with *Divine* Worship, but with a *Civil* and *Religious* Worship, such as is due to Kings and to Prophets on the account of him that sent them. The Lord Christ has an Office, that of King and Head of the Church, higher than any Angel; nay, so high, that he may make use of the Ministry of Angels in the Execution of his Office: therefore they are bid to worship him, not with *Divine* Worship, (no more than they were to worship *Israel* with such Worship) but with the Worship or *Respect* that is due to him in regard of his Office; as the Congregation worshipp'd *David*, in the Text last quoted, in regard of his Kingdom or Royal Dignity. But, as I observed

before, the Worship principally meant in the words, *Let all the Angels of God worship him*, is to be understood of succouring

and ministering to him, while he was upon Earth, as they were to worship *Israel*.

CHAP. III.

Continuation of the Examination of the Texts, objected from the Old Testament.

OUR Author's fifth Objection is from *Job. 1. 10, 11, 12.* (words taken from *Psal. 102. 25, 26, 27.*) And then, *Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest: they shall wax old as doth a Garment: And as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy Years shall not.* Let us add the next words, at *ver. 13.* But to which of the Angels said he at any time, *Sit at my Right-hand, until I make thine Enemies thy Foot-stool?*

He saith, these words here cited, to *v. 13.* are intended of the Son our Lord Christ; and that by ascribing to him the Creation of the Heavens and Earth, they assure us, both of the Pre-eternity and the Divinity of the said our Lord Christ.

We have seen before, that the Writers of the New Testament do accommodate divers Passages and Expressions of the Old Testament to our Saviour; tho originally, and in their primary Intention, they were meant of other Persons; because such Passages and Expressions had another, and a second Completion, in the Person of the Lord Christ. Thus, what was said of Solomon, *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*, is applied to our Saviour, because he also has an everlasting Throne: and what was said of *Israel*, *Out of Egypt I have called my Son*, is too accommodated to Christ; because he likewise was called out of Egypt, after the Death of *Atrah*. In like sort, in this Context to the Hebrews, what had been

said by the Psalmist, of God, and of the old or first Creation, (*Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundation of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands, &c.*) is accommodated to the Lord Christ, and to the new Creation which he hath made, even the new Heavens and the new Earth, in which (as *St. Peter* says of them) dwilleth Righteousness.

The Gospel-state and Times, or the Church in opposition to the Synagogue and Jewish Oeconomy, is described very often in Scripture, under the Names of the New Heavens and New Earth. *Isa. 65. 17. Behold, I create new Heavens, and a new Earth; and the former shall be remembered no more. Isa. 66. 22. As the new Heavens and the new Earth, which I will make, shall remain before me; so shall your Seed and your Name remain. St. Peter*, after he had described the fearful Dissolution of the Jewish Oeconomy and State, in terms much like those used by our Saviour on the same occasion and Subject, at *Mat. 24. add, 2 Pet. 3. 13. Nevertheless, according to his Promise, we look for new Heavens and a new Earth, wherein dwilleth Righteousness.* That is, a new Oeconomy and State, in which not so much a Ceremonial, as a Moral and true Righteousness, shall be taught and practised. *Rev. 21. 1. I saw a new Heaven, and a new Earth; for the first Heaven and the first Earth were passed away. i. e.* He saw the Church, or Christian Oeconomy begin; the Jewish or old Oeconomy, or Law was abolished.

All the Trinitarian Interpreters do thus understand these Texts; namely, that by the

the New Heavens and New Earth is meant the Gospel-state of things, in opposition to the Jewish, which is antiquated and done away. This is the Earth, and these the Heavens, of which the Lord Christ is the Maker, under God; partly by Himself, partly by his Apostles and other true Ministers of the Gospel: and these the Author to the *Hebrews* meant, when he says here, of our Lord Christ; *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thy Hands: they shall be changed,* (from their state of Probation and Trial, to a state of Perfection and Enjoyment) *but thou remainest for ever the same.*

The most Learned *Grotius*, whose Interpretation this is, rightly observes; that the *Hebrews*, to whom this Epistle was written, did commonly speak of the Times of the Messiah (or Christ) in these very terms here used: namely, that He should *make another World, New Heavens and Earth*; meaning thereby, a Total change of the face of things, in the Church and Religion. And those Forms of speaking, they borrowed from the Prophet *Isaiah*; whose words I have before quoted. Therefore in writing to them, it was no surprize to them; that this Epistle should accommodate the words of the *Prophetical Psalmist*, used by him concerning God and the first Creation, to the Messiah and the *New Creation*; because in him they had *Another, and Second Completion*.

Others of our Party, give other Accounts of this Text; this for one; that the words, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, &c.* are not at all (in any sense) intended of our *Saviours*; but are a devout Apostrophe Conversion or Address to God, that is, to the Father; so as to make this sense. "And truly thou, Lord, who hast thus anointed and exalted thy Son, art the God who hast laid the Foundations of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Work of thy Hands:—But to which of his Angels, hast this Glorious

"and *Unchangeable Creator* at any time said; as He doth by the Inspired and *Prophetical Psalmist* to the Son our Lord Christ; Sit on my right Hand, till I make thy Enemies thy Foot-stool? Here we ought to note, that the words, *Sit at my right Hand, till I make thy Enemies thy Foot-stool*, are originally and primarily intended of *David*; as is owned by the Trinitarian Interpreters: but they are applied to Christ in this Context to the *Hebrews*, because they are also a *Prophecy* of him; and of what God would do for him. In a word, their meaning, with respect to the Lord Christ, is this; God hath (in his Decree) said concerning the Messiah or Christ, who shall in due time be manifested, *Sit on my right hand, till I make thy Enemies thy Foot-stool*: This is the Sense of the words, as they stand in the Psalm. See the Learned Dr. *Patrick's* Paraphrase and Notes, on *Psal. 110. 1.*

I do not wonder, Sir, that our Opposer took no notice of these two Interpretations of these words, *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, &c.* they were too Rational and Probable, to be set in the same Light and View with the *Wild Construction*, that He and his Party make of this Context. For they make this Author to the *Hebrews*, to say; that the Lord Christ is the Creator of the *Visible Earth and Heavens*: and yet that 'tis Another Person, that must subdue to him the Enemies of his Kingdom, and make them his Foot-stool.

I had almost forgot, Sir, to tell you; that as *Grotius* is the Author of the first Interpretation, which I have given of this Context; so 'tis *Thomas Aquinas*, firmaned the *Magical Doctor*, thus has observed and suggested the other.

He alledgeth next (tho' not out of the Old Testament, according to his proposed Method) *Heb. 1. 1, 2. God who at sundry times—spake to the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last times spoken to us by his Son; by whom also He made the Worlds.* Our Author is not pleased to take notice, that *Gro-*

thus renders the last Clause by, *For whom also He made the World: i. e. the World was at first made, with intention to subject it (in the fulness of Time) to the Messiah and his Law.* And the Author to the *Hebrews*, rather chose to say here, *The World was made for the Messiah*; because it was a common Saying among the Jews, a part of their Doctrine and Belief concerning the Messiah; there is nothing more common in their Books, than this Saying, *The World was made for the Messiah, who shall be.*

Nor has our Opposer thought fit to observe, that some of the best Critics of his own Party, have thus rendered the objected Text; *By whom also he made the AGES*: and that they interpret the *AGES* to be the *Gospel-Ages*; which were made by the Ministry of our Lord Christ. No, these were Interpretations, which 'twas better for him to overlook, than to attempt, in vain, to refute them.

His seventh Proof is from *Isa. 9. 6. Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; his Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.*

He saith, this Text is *universally* applied to the Blessed Jesus; and that 'tis strange, that he should be called the *Mighty God*, if He is not God at all. He saith farther, that *Everlasting Father* could not without Absurdity be applied to the Lord Christ; if as the Socinians say of him, there was a time when He was not.

To this, the Author of the *Brief History* hath answered, that this Text of the Prophet is *never* applied to our Saviour, by any Writer of the New Testament: tho' Mr. *Milb.* is pleased here to say, 'tis universally applied to him. The Historian shows the Reason, why the Writers of the New Testament have not applied this Text to the Lord Christ; because it apparently speaks of one, actually born at that time when the Prophet wrote; *Unto us a Child IS born, unto us a Son IS given*; but the Prophet wrote about 700 Years before the

Birth of our Saviour. He adds, that *Gratius* and divers others (Christian and Orthodox, as well as Jewish Interpreters) understand the Text, of *Hezekiah*, afterwards King of *Judah*; and that it hath been Translated very extravagantly into English.

The truth is, there are almost as many Translations of this Verse, as there are Interpreters. Instead of the words, *Counsellor, the Mighty God*; the LXX Interpreters say, *the Angel (or Messenger) of Great Counsel*; i. e. the Wise Messenger: they wholly omit the following words, even these, *the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, &c.* those words (it should seem) have been added since their time, to the Hebrew Copies of the Bible.

The Fathers generally follow this Translation of the LXX. *St. Luther*, who understood the Hebrew very well, instead of *Mighty God*, saith, *the Mighty Hero, or Warrior.* *Gratius* saith, *the Consulter of the Mighty God*; and interprets thus, *Hezekiah* shall consult with God, not with the Idols of his Father *Ahas*, both in his Enterprizes and his Troubles. For *Everlasting Father*, *St. Hieron* and other Critics read, *the Father of the Age*; and for the *Prince of Peace*, they read *the Peaceable Prince*: because *Hezekiah* would not enterprize Needless Wars; but seek to maintain the Peace, Property and Plenty of his People.

When the words in the Original (Hebrew or Greek) are of such doubtful and ambiguous Construction; 'tis the manner of our Opposers, to take that Occasion, to set up their *Wonders*: We, on the contrary, affect not *Atomistries*; but are governed by the obvious Reason and Possibilities of things. We think, 'tis enough to determine us to some or other of the *Reasonable* and *Possible* Senses, before-mentioned; that the Writers of the New Testament never apply this Text to our Saviour; and because the Prophet so plainly speaks of a Child then born, *Unto us a Child IS born, unto us a Son IS given.*

His eighth Text from the Old Testament, is, *Jerem. 23. 4, 6. The days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up to David a Righteous Branch;—in his days, Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is the Name wherewith He shall be called, The LORD our Righteousness.* This BRANCH, saith our Author, is by Rabbins and Fathers interpreted to be the Messias or Christ: and that He is God, appears by the Name here given to him, *Jehovah Tsedekenn, or the Lord our Righteousness.* And agreeable to this Interpretation, the Apostle saith, *1 Cor. 1. 30. The Lord Christ is of God made to us, Wisdom and Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption.*

Our Author's first and great Mistake here, is this; that on Supposition, that 'tis the Lord Christ who is here called the Lord our Righteousness, He must needs be true God. For let us hear another Text of this Prophet, *Jerem. 33. 16. In those days Judah shall be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the Name wherewith SHE (Jerusalem) shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.* We see by this last Text, that the Lord our Righteousness in the other Text, is not meant of the Branch, (whether that Branch be the Lord Christ, as our Author thinks; or Zorobabel, as *Gratius* has proved) but *Israel*, the Nation of *Israel*: So that we ought to understand the objected Text, after this manner. "In those days, "I will raise up to David, a Righteous Branch;—and in his time Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is the Name, wherewith He (*Israel*, not the Branch) shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.

'Tis promised here in these Texts, that *Israel* and *Jerusalem* shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness; in the days of Zorobabel, who was their Governour (Vice-King for the King of *Babylon*) immediately after the return from the Captivity: because it would

then please God, to pardon all the past Sins of that People, and to deal with them as a Righteous People; notwithstanding their former Transgressions, and National Revolts from him.

Others have observed, that the words in both Contexts, may be rendered the Lord our Justifier; or the Lord is our Justifier: and so they make this Sense; In the Days of the Branch, in the Government of Zorobabel of the House of David; God will justify and deliver us, from all our Adversaries and Persecutors.

His last Old Testament Text, is *Micah. 2. 2. Thou Bethlehem,—out of thee shall come forth unto me, that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from Old, from Everlasting; or, from the Days of Eternity.* He noteth, that this Text is interpreted of the Lord Christ; even by the chief Priests and Scribes of the Jews, *Matth. 2. 4, 5, 6.*

Tho our Author had not Designed to take notice, what the Heterodox Socinians Answer, in defence of their Doctrine of the Unity of God; or how They interpret the Texts, objected to that Heresy of theirs: yet at least Mr. *Calvin* was worthy to be heard. This famous Reformer owns, that the Prophet's meaning is only this; the Goings forth of the Lord Christ have been Decreed by God, from the Days of Eternity.

But *Gratius* instead of *From Everlasting*, or from the Days of Eternity, hath Translated here from *ancient Days*; and so (All know) the words may be rendered: therefore he maketh the Sense to be this; whose Goings forth (*i. e.* whose Descent, Original, or Pedigree) is of Old, from Ancient Times. For Christ is come of that most Ancient Stock of David, of the Town of *Bethlehem*.

Our Author may please, in his next, to try his Skill on these Solutions: in the mean time, I pass to what He hath objected from the New Testament.

C H A P. IV.

On his Texts out of the Gospels.

THEY are not many Texts, Sir, on which our Author has insisted to prove his Proposition, that our Lord Christ is *true God*; but He assures us (at P. 309.) they are *Choice Ones*: We have considered those He alleges from the Old Testament, let us now examine what He hath urged out of the New.

On the Texts of St. Matthew.

He begins with *Matth. 1. 22, 23.* *This was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord, by the Prophet, saying, A Virgin shall Conceive, and shall bring forth a Son; and they shall call his Name Immanuel; which being interpreted, is, God with us.*

He notes, that these words are spoken of the Lord Christ; and that the Name *Immanuel* (or *God with us*) has been appropriated to him, by God: for we no where find, that He hath given this Name to any other. But where God giveth a Name, and the Spirit of God interprets it; it cannot be insignificant: from whence it follows, that the Lord Christ is indeed *God Eternal*, and *God with us*.

To this, I say; tho' the Consonants of the Hebrew Name *Immanuel* may be so *Pointed*, that the Name may be interpreted *God with Him*; which would turn the Objection from this Text, upon our Opposers: yet that is not here to be insisted on; because we shall see presently, that in giving that Name, it was really intended, the Child should be called or named *God with Us*. The Text here objected out of *St. Matthew*, is taken from *Isa. 7.* where that Prophet tells *Ahaz* King of *Judah*, who was at that time invaded by the Confederate Kings of *Syria* and *Israel*; that the Confederacy of these two Kings against

Judah, should in the end come to nothing: and that *Israel* should be destroyed from being any longer a Nation, within the term of 65 Years. And for a Sign to you, says the Prophet, that God will bring this to pass; a Virgin (one who at present is a Virgin) shall forthwith Conceive by her Husband, and bring forth a Son, whom God will have to be called *Immanuel*, or *God with Us*; because before this Child is of Years of Discretion to know Good and Evil, God will indeed appear to be on our Side; He will withdraw by Death the two Kings, who are Confederate against us. There is no Learned Critic that doubts, that the Child here promised by the Prophet to be a Sign of the Truth of what He had said, about the Confederacy of the two Kings, and the final Destruction of the Kingdom of *Israel*, is *Maher-Shalal-Hashbaz* Son of this Prophet, by the Wife whom (it should seem) He had lately taken: And They observe, that this is the Reason, why he saith in the next Chapter; *I and the Children whom the Lord hath given me, are for Signs to Israel, from the Lord, Isa. 8. 18.* But whether the Child *Immanuel* was the Son of the Prophet, or of some other; this is certain, that He was to be a Sign to King *Ahaz*, and to the People of *Israel* and *Judah*. This Child being to be such a Sign, the Sign of so favourable a Providence to *Judah* and *Ahaz*, had an Answerable Name given to him by order from God; even *Immanuel*, or *God with Us*. Therefore our Author's First Observation is certainly false; that the Name *Immanuel* was appropriated to the Lord Christ, and no more given by God to any other Person. And so too is his other Note, that because God gave to him the Name *Immanuel*, He must needs be *true God*; for God gave the same Name

Name to the Child that was to be a Sign to *Abrax* and *Judah*, that God would be with them (or for them) by destroying their Enemies, the Syrians and Israelites.

We see that the words of the Prophet were originally intended, of a Child that was to be a Sign to *Abrax* and *Judah*; and that there was a good reason why that Name should be given to him. But St. *Matthew* accommodates and applies both the Prophecy and the Name to our Lord Christ, because in him they had another and a second Completion; we may say, a more perfect Completion. For the Lord Christ was our *Immanuel*, or God with us; not only as he was a Sign that God would be on our side, which was the only reason of the Name of the first *Immanuel*; but because he did really conciliate God to us, and us to God; and because God was with him, and is him, by an extraordinary Effusion of his Spirit upon him.

No one can be so blind or obstinate, as not to acknowledge, that this Interpretation (which indeed is not ours, but advanced by divers of the principal Trinitarian Interpreters) is easy and rational, perfectly agreeable to the scope of the Prophet; and also to the manner of writing observed by this, and the other Evangelists; who very usually apply divers Texts of the Old Testament, intended originally of other Persons, to the Lord Christ; because in him they had a second and (very often) a more perfect fulfilling. Therefore let our Opposers show cause why we should depart from an Interpretation every way reasonable, to embrace and adhere to theirs; which implies a Doctrine contrary to the first Commandment, and to the whole Current of Scripture, even this, that there is more than one Divine Person, or more than one who is true God.

His second Argument is from *Mat. 28. 19. Teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. He observes here, that the Son and Spirit are set equally with the Father, as Ob-

jects of our Baptismal Faith; which either proves their real Equality, or is of dangerous Import, for 'tis apt to impress upon us false Notions of the Deity, and to make us think those to be really equal, who are not so. He saith moreover, that in other Texts where God is joined with his Creatures; a distinction is made, whereby to discern that one is God, and the other but Creatures; but not so in this Text; we are bid here to be baptized, equally and alike to the Father, Son and Spirit, without any Note of Dignity or Superiority in one more than in another of them; therefore they must be understood to be equal.

It may be our Author knows not, that some Learned Critics have given very strong Reasons why they believe, that these words of the objected Text, *In the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, were not spoke by our Saviour, but have been added to the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, from the common Form and Practice of the Church in administering Baptism; as 'tis certain that these words, *For this is the Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory for ever*, have been added to the Lord's Prayer in the same Gospel of St. *Matthew*, from the Greek Liturgies or Forms of Common-Prayer. These Critics observe, that Cardinal *Ballarmin* is very angry with the Unitarians who maintained the Dispute at *Alba*; because they said, those words were added to the Bible but only since the *Nicene* Council had corrupted the Faith; all Antiquity, saith the Cardinal, is witness against them, that those words were always read in the Gospel of St. *Matthew*. But the Learned Cardinal does not produce one Testimony, in Confirmation of what he says, tho he uses to be very free in his Quotations of Fathers, and ancient Ecclesiastical Historians. In short, we have nothing but Cardinal *Ballarmin*'s word for it, that the Ancients did read the words, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*.

Whereas some pretend to find these words cited by St. *Ignatius*, as spoken by
our

our Saviour, in the Epistle of the said *Ignatius* to the Philippians: that Epistle is (all of it) a meer Forgery, by Confession of all the Criticks who have publish'd the Works of *Ignatius*, or have written Notes upon them. They observe, that Epistle is never quoted by any of the Ancients, nor was heard of in the World before *Ado Vienneſis*, who flourish'd about the Year 859.

Eusebius, the famous Ecclesiastical Historian, quotes the objected Text nine times in several parts of his Works, but never with the words, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; he reads thus, *Teach all Nations in my Name, instructing them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you*.

The constant Practice of the ancient Unitarians, was, to baptize only in the Name of the Lord Christ; and therefore it was ordered by the Councils of *Nice* and *Laodicea*, that the Paulinists (i. e. the Unitarians) who came over to the Church, should be re-baptized. Whether they or the Catholick Church (so called) are in the right concerning the Form of Baptism, is best determined from the Practice of the Apostles: for we cannot well suppose, that if the Form prescribed by our Saviour himself, was, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, that the Apostles would depart from that Form; or that 'twas lawful for them to do. But where-ever there is mention in Scripture-History, of the Administration of Baptism, either by the Apostles, or by their Order, the Form of such Baptism was only, *In the Name of the Lord Christ*; or, *Unto the Lord Christ*. Acts 2. 38. Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of the Lord Jesus. The same thing is said at Acts 8. 16. Acts 10. 48. Acts 19. 5. Rom. 6. 3. Gal. 3. 27. 1 Cor. 1. 13. Add to this, that besides the Schoolmen and other Moderns, *St. Basil*, *St. Hilary* and *St. Ambrose*, do expressly own, that the Apostles administered Baptism only in the Name of the Lord Jesus. Finally, the other Evangelists mention the Institution of

Baptism by our Saviour after his Resurrection; but they say not, that he appointed it to be administered, *In the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*; which 'tis not likely they would have omitted, if our Saviour had enjoined that Form of performing the Rite of Baptism. Nay, it should seem, by what *St. Luke* says, that the Form of Baptism appointed by our Saviour, was only in his (Christ's) Name, not in the Name of more Persons. Luke 24. 46, 47. Jesus said unto them, that Repentance, and Remission of Sins should be preached in his Name, unto all Nations. Here Remission of Sins seems to be no other thing but Baptism administered in Christ's Name, as a sign of the Remission of Sins; and therefore it is, that elsewhere instead of Repentance and Remission of Sins; the holy Writers say Repentance and Baptism: so *St. Peter* speaks, Acts 2. 38. Repent, and be baptized, in the Name of the Lord Jesus. To this effect speak the fore-mentioned Criticks; and from hence they infer, that we cannot make use of this Text to warrant the Church's Form of Baptism, *In the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit*, much less to prove that the two latter are God (or Gods) equal with the Father.

I desire and resolve, Sir, to argue this great Question, concerning the Divinity of our Saviour; or, whether there is more than one Divine Person, with all possible sincerity: Therefore I will ingenuously own to you, that tho the before-mentioned Exceptions to this Text, are not without their weight; yet I have observed divers things, which make me to think, that this Text is a genuine part of Scripture, was spoken by our Saviour, and written by *St. Matthew*.

First, 'Tis found in all the Copies of the Bible, both Printed and Manuscript, and in all the ancient Translations, which cannot be said of any other Text, which is rejected by us or by our Opposers; all the doubtful and suspected Texts are wanting in divers Copies of the Original Greek, and

of the Ancient Translations. I conceive, we ought not to argue against the Truth of any Text from only *Negative* Proofs, or from some *possible* Interpretations of other Texts, tho' those Texts are perhaps many. It ought to be shown, that either Church-Historians or Fathers have said, that such Text was *not* read, or was otherwise read in the Copies of their Times.

Secondly, To the Allegations out of the Acts of the Apostles, and some Epistles of St. Paul; it may be answered, That those Texts mention only the Name of the Lord Jesus, and not the other two Names, the Father and the Holy Ghost; because by the Name of the Lord Jesus, and unto the Lord Jesus, they mean, to the Profession of the Lord Jesus, and of the Doctrine by him taught, without at all intending to express by those words the Form of Baptism, which every one knew to be in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. I like this Interpretation; because when St. Paul asked some Disciples at Ephesus, whether they had yet received the Holy Ghost? and they had answered, that they had not heard whether there was an Holy Ghost: He replies, *Unto what then were ye baptized?* Acts 19. 3. This Reply of the Apostle seems to suppose, that if they were baptized with Christian Baptism, (and not only with the Baptism of John) they must needs have heard of the Holy Ghost, because the Form was in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Thirdly, The ancient Unitarians baptized only in the Name of the Lord Christ. I think 'tis grounded only on the Report of Pope Innocent I. who might not understand their Discipline, or designedly misreport it: and besides, his Epistles are supposed to be forged by most learned Men; because they make mention of Rites and Persons that were not in Being in Innocent's time.

Lastly; Whereas the Unitarians at Alba said, that this Text has been added to St. Matthew since the first Nicene Council; tho' Cardinal Bellarmine has only denied this,

he might most easily have proved the contrary. For Tertullian, who flourish'd above 120 Years before the Nicene Council, often quotes this Text. In his Book concerning Baptism, Chap. 12, he saith, *The Law of baptizing is impos'd, and the Form prescribed: Go, saith he, teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.* And again, in his Book against Praxeas, Chap. 26. *After his Resurrection, he commanded, that they should baptize to the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; not to out of them only.*

It is true, none of the Ante-Nicene Fathers do ever alledge this Form of Baptism, to prove the Divinity of the Son or Holy Spirit; but the reason of that was, because tho' they allowed that the Son might be called God, on account of his perfect Conjunction (by Love, Unity of Will, and Subjection) with the Father, who only is true God; yet they thought otherwise of the Holy Ghost: some of them understanding him to be only the Energy, or Power of God; others that he was a Creature of the Son, and only the chief of the ministering Spirits or Angels. But to return to our Opposer.

He saith, We are baptized alike and equally to the Father, Son and Spirit; therefore the two latter are equal in all respects to the former, or, are God no less than he; they are mentioned together in this Text, without any Note of Dignity or Superiority in one more than in another; which were of dangerous Consequence, and apt to lead Men into Error, if only one of these is true God.

But, 'Tis not true, that here is no Note of Distinction or Superiority; for the words at length are these; *All Power is given to me, in Heaven and Earth; go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.* I would know of our Opposer, what greater Distinction could be made, than our Saviour here makes between God and himself? doth he not here expressly profess and own, that his Power is given to

D him;

him; that he hath received it from the Liberality of another, and not from himself? Can any one be said to give Power to himself? And the Apostle hath told us, how we are to understand it, that all Power is given to the Lord Christ; in these words to the *Epistians*, God gave to him to be *Head over all things, to the Church*: Ephes. 1. 22. As who should say, He is over all things, and hath all Power, with respect to the Church: 'tis He, and He only that must prescribe her standing Laws and Rites; and appoint by what Persons, and what Means, the Church shall be first gathered, and then preserved.

2. But supposing now there had been no Note of Superiority here made, or Distinction of Dignity and Power; I see not what could be truly inferred from thence to the advantage of our Author's Cause. For when God is joined in the same form of Speech with any others; sure that needs not to be expressed, which all Men know and acknowledg, even God's Superiority above all others. 1 Chron. 29. 20. *The Congregation bowed their Heads, and worshipped the Lord, and the King.* 1 Tim. 3. 21. *I charge thee before God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Elect Angels.* Rev. 22. 17. *The Spirit and the Bride say, Come.* Will our Author say upon these Texts, and upon that other (parallel) Text, 1 Sam. 12. 18. *All the People greatly feared the Lord, and Samuel?* Will he say, that *Samuel* and *David*, the Angels and the Bride (i. e. the Church) are equal with God or with the Spirit, because they are mentioned together, without any Note of Distinction, or of Dig-

nity and Superiority in one more than in the other? The Acts of Religion mentioned in those Texts, are no less solemn or important than Baptism is; *fixing the Lord, worshipping the Lord, adorning by the Lord*, are the very highest Acts of Devotion and Religion; yet even in them God is joined with Creatures, without any Mark of Distinction or Superiority; because (as I said) when God is joined with any others, there is no need of such Note or Mark.

Therefore the more learned of our Opposers, especially the Ancients of the first 400 Years, do not insist on this Text of *St Matthew*, to prove the Divinity or Personality of the Son or Spirit; by these words, *In the Name of the Father, Son and Spirit*, they understand only, *to the Profession, and to the Obedience of the Father, Son and Spirit*. According to these Critics, the Sense of the objected Text is only this: Baptize the Nations into the Profession and Obedience of the Father, or God, and of Jesus Christ, whom the Father hath commanded us to *hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto us*; and of the other Teacher, even the Spirit or Inspiration of God, by which he advises and comforts the Faithful in all extraordinary Exigences. Our Author may please to consult Mr. Pool's Collections on this Text, where he will see divers such Interpretations as this, all of them by the Critics of his own Party, and all of them consistent with the *Unity of God*, as 'tis held by the Socinians. Therefore all those Interpreters and Critics must be understood as giving up to us this Text.

C H A P. V.

On the first Verses of St. John's Gospel.

OUR Author's next Effort, is from that well-known Context, even the first Verses of St. John's Gospel: The Clauses by him urged, are these; *In the Beginning was the WORD; and the WORD was with God, and the WORD was God. All things were made by Him, namely by the WORD; and without Him was not any thing made, that was made. He was in the World, and the World was made by him; and the World knew him not.* Others have added to these; *And the WORD was made Flesh, and dwelt among us.* Also that Testimony of the Baptist, *He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.*

Our Author endeavours to Ridicule the common Socinian Interpretation of these Verses, by Misrepresenting it; and by concealing the remarkable and probable Proofs, which the Socinians add to every Clause of their Interpretation.

He recites also the Explication of this Context by Dr. Hammond; which, he saith, is a full Explication, and the Sense of the Catholic Church. Indeed Dr. Hammond has given us the Belief of the Catholic Church, to called; and has set it down as the Sense of this Context of St. John: but that's the very thing in question, whether that Belief be the Sense of these Verses.

Our present Opposer has performed so Meanly, in the long Discourse he has made on this Proem of St. John's Gospel, that I am not willing to be seen, maintaining a Scuffle with him. Others of his Party have known, how to make a vigorous Opposition, from this Context; the sum of what they say, is,

Every Clause here objected, is a several Argument against the Socinian-Heresy: The First declares the Real Divinity of our Savi-

our, by asserting his Eternity; in these words, *In the Beginning* (as who should say, from the very First, or from all Eternity) *was the WORD.* The second Clause saith, *The WORD was with God,* to signify the continual and perpetual Generation of the WORD or Son; and also the mutual Intistence of these two Divine Persons in one another. The next yet more Directly, and even Expressly, contradicts the Socinians; by saying, *the WORD was God:* They say, He was a *Man*, and no more than a *Man.* 'Tis true, they allow He may be called God, in such sense as *Moses* is called a God; (and that by God himself) at *Exod. 7. 1.* in that He was to represent the Person of God, being to deliver God's Commands to *Pharaoh*, to *Israel*, and to the *Egyptians*; But our Evangelist has been careful to prevent these Evasions, by telling us what kind of God the WORD was; *All things* (saith he) *were made by him, and without him was not any thing made, that was made.*

And lest Incredulous and Obstinate Men should interpret *all things* in these words, to be only *All things belonging to the Gospel-state*; or the whole Oeconomy and Doctrine of the Gospel; as the Socinians would now wrest St. John's words: To prevent (I say) this Elusion, he adds yet farther; *He was in the World, and the World was made by him.* But this Holy Evangelist has not yet done with them: He says, at *K. 14.* *The Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us:* 'Twere Nonsense to speak so, of a Person who was only a *Man*; Who ever said, *Peter* or *James* were made *Flesh*, and dwelt among us? Would it not be Ridiculous so to speak? Therefore the Lord Jesus was more than a *Man*, He was God made *Flesh*, that is to say, *Man*; for *Flesh* is a very usual

Scripture-Term for Man. He was made Man, by being Incarnate in an Human Nature, by an Hypostatical Union to a Body of Flesh and a Rational Soul. This Evangelist has given us too, the Testimony of the other *John*, even *John the Baptist*, concerning the Pre-existence or Pre-eternity of our Saviour; *He that cometh after me, is preferred before me, for he was before me.* We are expressly told by *St. Luke*, that *John Baptist* was six Months older than our Lord Christ, as Man: Therefore when *St. John* says, Christ was before him; it must be thus understood, that as God He was before *John*, tho as Man He was younger than *John*.

It is true, the Socinians have strained their Wits, to give other Senses of these Verses; or so to interpret them, as to make their Saviour nothing but a Man; not God, not a Creatour, no not so much as an Angel, but a meer Man. Now when Expressions may have divers Senses, it sometimes happens, that there are no *Primitive Acts*, to ascertain one of the Senses above, or rather than another of them: but Providence has been watchful on behalf of the true Faith, and the Catholic Interpretation of these Verses, by preserving to us *Ancient Acts*, and such as must needs satisfy sincere and teachable Persons; the Church is in possession of most certain Records, by which the indubitably proves the Catholic Interpretation of this Context.

The Socinians are not the First Authors of this Heresy, that there is but one Divine Person, (even the God and Father of our Lord Christ); and that the Lord Christ was nothing else but a Prophet, and the Holy Spirit only the Power and Inspiration of God. The *Nazarens*, and *Christians*, and *Ebion*, immediately after the Death of the Apostles, began to propagate this Heresy, to the great Offence and Scandal of the Churches: And it so happened, that many hearkened to them; insomuch that the Bishops and Churches of *Asia* importuned *St. John*, to write somewhat more expressly concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, than had

been yet done by any of the Apostles.

St. John was at length prevailed on, to do as they desired; only he requested, that a General Fast might be held, to invoke the Aid of God on his Undertaking. The Fast being ended, the Holy Ghost fell upon him; and He began his Gospel with these words, which came to him from Heaven; *In the Beginning was the WORD, and the Word was with God, and the WORD was God; All things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made, that was made.* This Relation is made by *St. Jerome*, *Proem. Com. in Matth.* And he declares in the same place; that this was no uncertain Rumour, nor a thing of Hear-say; *Sed ita narrat Ecclesiastica Historia, The Church-History so tells us.*

The Socinians therefore swear to no purpose, in devising Comments or *Elysions* on this Context, which was designedly written against them: 'tis in vain for them to oppose their own Inventions to *Primitive Acts*, which tell us plainly; that this Gospel was written on purpose against their Heresy; nay, that the words of it, with which we pretend to confute them, came down from Heaven; or were spoken against them from Heaven; *St. John* being only the Penman, not the Author of them.

Thus it is, Sir, that the Socinians are Baffled, by false and Sensitive Translations, supported by Fictions and Legends. There never was a Greater *Blasemy*, than this Tale of *St. Jerome* out of an Ecclesiastical History, never seen by any body but Himself. *Innaeus*, two Hundred Years older than *St. Jerome*, and therefore so much nearer to matter of Fact, could say nothing of *St. John's Gospel*; but this: *He published it at Ephesus, in Asia, Advrs. Hæres. Lib. 3. c. 1. Orig.* who had made so diligent a search among all the Monuments of Antiquity, that He might be able to give an exact Account of the Writers of Holy Scriptures; says, "Concerning the four Evangelists, we have received by Tradition, as follows. *St. Matthew*, first a Publican; afterwards "an Apostle, wrote his Gospel in Hebrew; " for

" for the sake of the Jews who believed.
 " St. Mark wrote his Gospel, as St. Peter
 " declared it to him. The third is the
 " Gospel of Luke, approved by St. Paul;
 " and written for the sake of the Heathens.
 " Lastly, St. John's Gospel. Had St. Jerome seen
 an Ecclesiastical History that *Origen* never
 saw: or would *Origen* have omitted such a
 Famous Occasion, and Confirmation of
 St. John's Gospel, when he tells us the Oc-
 casions, and Approvers of the other Go-
 spels? The words of *Origen*, before quoted;
 were extant in his Fourth Book of *Comments*
 on St. Matthew; they are preserved by *Euse-
 bius*. Hist. Lib. 6. c. 25. *Eusebius* spends
 a whole Chapter, concerning the Order of
 the Evangelists; and declares the true Occa-
 sion and Cause of St. John's Writing: which,
 according to him, was this. It being, saith
 he, observed; that the other Evangelists
 had wrote only that part of the *Actions* and
Sayings of our Saviour, which he *did* and
spoke after the Imprisonment of John the Bap-
 tist. To supply this Defect, St. John was
 desired to commit to writing, what he re-
 membered of our Saviour, before the Bap-
 tist was imprison'd. In a word, he wrote
 his Gospel, to supply the Omissions of the other
 Three Evangelists. *Euseb.* Lib. 3. c. 24. *Euse-
 bius* had read *Hegesippus*, and whatever
 Church-History St. Jerome could have read;
 and he has made it his Business, to make
 Extracts out of all ancient Books, concern-
 ing the Writers and Writings of the New
 Testament: the diligence and exactness of
 this Historian, is much admired and praised
 by all Learned Men; nor will any such be-
 lieve, that St. Jerome had seen an Ecclesiasti-
 cal History, which *Eusebius* had not seen.
 St. Jerome says, St. John wrote to oppose the
 Unitarian Heresy; and that the first words
 of his Gospel, were pronounced to him from
 Heaven. *Eusebius* says, John had written
 his Gospel, because the other Evangelists
 had omitted the *Gifts* and *Sayings* of our Sa-
 viour; that were before the Imprisonment
 of the Baptist. St. Jerome refers, for what
 he says, to an Ecclesiastical History, un-

known to all the Ancients but Himself. *Euse-
 bius* proves the Account he gives, by solid
 and convincing Arguments. His words, in
 the Chapter before quoted, are these. " It
 " is evident, that the other three Evange-
 " lists have committed to writing, only the
 " Gifts of our Saviour during one Year's
 " space; namely, after John the Baptist's be-
 " ing shut in Prison. *Matthew* sets forth
 " the time of his writing, in these words;
 " When Jesus had heard that John was put in
 " Prison, He came into Galilee. In like man-
 " ner, *Mark* saith; Now after that John was
 " put in Prison, Jesus came into Galilee.
 " Luke also maketh this Remark; Herod
 " adding this to all the Events he had done, that
 " John is Prison. Therefore they say,
 " that the Apostle John, being for this
 " Cause thereto requested, has declared in
 " a Gospel according to him, the time that
 " was passed over in silence by the other
 " Evangelists, and what was done by our
 " Saviour therein. This is a probable Ac-
 count; that of St. Jerome is Miraculous, and
 therefore pleases them who are taken with
 Marvellous things.

What shall we say then, that St. Jerome
 desired, or that he dreams of an Ecclesiasti-
 cal History; which was never seen before
 nor since: neither of them; for I doubt
 not, that his Tale is nothing else but an
 Improvement; and a stretch of some words
 of *Clement* Alexander, which he found re-
 corded in the Ecclesiastical History of *Euse-
 bius*, Lib. 6. c. 12. The words were ta-
 ken by *Eusebius*, out of the *Institutions* of
Clement Alexander, which Institutions are now
 lost: but *Photius* (Cod. 105, and 111.)
 has left us this Character of them; that
 they contained very many *Fables* & *Un-
 der-
 stood* *Nos*, *Fabulous* and *Impious Tales*. Of these
 Tales, this is one; " John, the last of the
 " Evangelists, seeing that what appertain'd
 " to Christ's Humanity, was manifested in
 " the other Gospels; being thereto moved
 " by his Acquaintance, and inspired by the
 " Spirit, wrote a Gospel concerning Christ's
 " Divinity.

But to return to our Opposers; They commonly say, St. *John* wrote his Gospel against *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, and the Heresy of the Unitarians: We have seen, they have no solid ground for this Pretence, in the History of the Church; *Irenæus* and *Origen* (the most Learned of the Ancients) knew nothing of it; and *Eusebius* gives a contrary Account. But the Gospel it self, written by St. *John*, will best decide this Question: if he has more confirmed this (pretended) Heresy, than any other Writer of Holy Scripture; He did not, without doubt, write his Gospel against it. Therefore let us (briefly) see, what the Unitarian Doctrine is; and how St. *John* hath delivered his Mind concerning it.

We say; that only the Father is true God, that the Lord Christ is his Prophet and Messenger to Man; that therefore what the Lord Christ said, was not from himself, or by his own Authority, but by particular Command and Charge from God; that all the Miracles he did, were not properly done by him, but by the Spirit or Power of the Father given to him, as to former Prophets. Let us hear, how St. *John* in his Gospel, written designedly against us, confutes this impious Heresy: John 17. 1, 2, 3. Father, — this is Life Eternal, to know thee (the only true God) and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent: Or Jesus Christ thy Messenger. John 7. 16. My Doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. John 12. 49. The Father which sent me, He gave me a Commandment what I should say, John 14. 31. As the Father gave me Commandment, so do I. John 5. 30. I can do nothing of my self. John 14. 10 The Father that dwelleth in me, (by his Spirit, Energy or Power) He doeth the Works.

I know not what could be said more effectually, to evince, that the Lord Christ is not God, but the Ambassador only, and Messenger of God; speaking, according to the Instructions and Charge given to him; and Acting by a Power (not of his own, but) bestowed on him, as on former Prophets and Messengers of God. If the Texts before

cited were not the very words of Scripture; were they found in any other Book, they should be Anathematiz'd as most Gross Socinianism, as the very Heresy of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, against whom (as saith St. *Jerom's* Ecclesiastical History) they were written.

And what wretched Subterfuges do our Opposers make use of, to decline these plain Testimonies, that were suggested by the Holy Ghost against them: for we dare not, like them, feign Ecclesiastical Histories, which say, they were spoken against them from Heaven. First, They tell us; St. *John* doth not say, that only the Father is God, but the Father is the only true God. They say, the Socinians have not had the Wit, to perceive the vast difference between those two Expressions: It may be true, they say, and is true, that the Father is the only true God, as St. *John* in the alleged Text says; and yet the Son too is true God, nay the only true God; and the like of the Holy Ghost.

And when *John* says; neither the Doctrine nor the Actions of our Saviour were his own; but the Commandments of the Father given to him, and the Works of the Father dwelling in him: By the Father in those Texts, they say, we are to understand Three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Nay, when our Saviour saith; Of that Day and Hour (the Excision of Jerusalem, and the Dissolution of the Jewish Policy) none knoweth; not the Angels, neither the Son, but the Father only: 'Tis not true for all that, that the Father only (or only the Father) knoweth that Day and Hour, for then only the Father were true God; but the Father only in those words, is not the Father only, but also the Son, (who is there expressly denied to know that Day and Hour) and besides him the Holy Ghost.

Well, but however these things are, St. *John* has paid us off (they say,) in his Proem, or first Verses of his Gospel, in those words which came to him from Heaven.

But

But if the Heavenly Words were but honestly translated, the Socinians would not fear any Inference that would be drawn from them. Our Protestant Opposers value themselves very much on this account, that they have given to the People the holy Bible in the Vulgar Languages: it may however be said, that they have only been more crafty than the Papists in imposing upon the People. The Papists have sillily raised against themselves a Clamour for withholding the Bible from the People, and keeping it lock'd up in only the Learned Languages; and in those Countries where they have been constrained to translate the Bible, they have been so jealous, as to forbid the Commonalty of their Communion the use of their own Translations. The Protestants have been wiser, tho not a whit more sincere; for they have made Translations of the Bible into all Languages, and so far have they been from forbidding the use of them, that they encourage it with all their Might, well knowing the Benefit that must arise to themselves thereby; for they know they have printed all the Bibles that are in the Original Greek Tongue, from only such Manuscript Copies, as *have been corrected* to speak the Language of the Church; and from Bibles so corrected and printed, they have made their Translations: nor has the Fraud stopp'd here, for wheresoever there is an Ambiguity in the Original Hebrew or Greek, they have always so translated, as to confirm their own Doctrines. This was the right method to establish their Opinions, nor that unjudicious impolitical course taken by the Papists, which begets suspicion of them, and has therefore been a great means of their Overthrow: there has been nothing so plausibly and effectually urged against them, as this, that they have been afraid to let the People have the Word of God, and that their Opposers desire and endeavour nothing more. But if those who boast so much of this Service done by them to the People, had meant as well, or if they

would be owned for Persons that have bestowed the Word of God on their Flocks, they should have put into the Margin of their Translations, those *other Translations* of which (they know) the Original Greek and Hebrew Text is capable, and with those Translations, the *other Readings* in the Manuscript Copies. This had been plain dealing: but you must excuse them, 'twould have have hazarded those Remains of Popery, (and which indeed are the principal parts of Popery) that they thought fit still to retain: those *other Readings* of the Manuscript Copies, and the *other Translations* of famous Critics, would have enabled even the common People to perfect the Reformation beyond the Standard intended by these Translators. The People would have been questioning the Doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Original Sin, the Servitude of our Wills to *Evil* only, and other such like Doctrines, against which they cannot now so much as once open. The Translators were aware, that such a Translation and Edition of our Bibles would have made all Men Divines; because to understand, and to be able to judge, is not peculiar to Men that know Greek or Latin, but is common and natural to all Mankind, and to every Man, tho he understands but one Language. But 'tis time to give the sense of this so much controverted Beginning of St. John's Gospel: I must crave leave however to premise this one thing.

'Tis a Rule of Criticism approved, and urged also by the Learnedest of our Opposers; that the Writers of the New Testament have a particular regard to the Notions and Opinions of the Jewish Church; as also to the Customs, and Forms of Speech in use among that People; so that such as happen to be altogether ignorant, either of the Doctrines current among the Jews, or of their Customs and Forms of speaking; such will sometimes widely mistake in interpreting the New Testament. To instance in only such Opinions and Forms of Speech as were frequent among them con-

cerning.

cerning the *Messias*, or *Christ*; 'tis certain, they called him *the WORD*; this is seen in divers places of their Chaldee Paraphrases, which they used to read in their Synagogues; and in very many places of *Philo-Judeus*, who was contemporary to the Apostles. They said also of the *Messias* who was to come, that *the World was made for him*; meaning thereby, that the *World* was at first made by God, with intention to subject it, in the fulness of time, to the *Messias* and his Law: See *Grotius* on *Heb.* 1. 2. and on *Heb.* 1. 10, 11, 12. They added, as the same *Grævus* there observes, that the *Messias* should make a new and a better *World*. In what sense they meant this, and how they proved it, I have shewn before at *Chap.* 3. where I give an account of *Heb.* 1. 10, 11. Moreover, they used the words *El* and *Elohim* (which the Greeks render by *Θεός*, the English by the word *God*) of Angels, Kings and Magistrates, and of all such as are extraordinary Messengers and Ministers of God: I need not to prove this, our Opposers confess it, and 'tis an Observation made by our Saviour himself, at *John* 10. 35. These Keys will let us into the sense of the Verses about which we are contending, without multiplying *Divine Persons*, or *Gods*, as the Trinitarians do, or *Creators*, as is here done by the Arians.

In the beginning. That is, say our Opposers, *From the very first*, from for ever, or from all Eternity. But when *Moses* says, *In the beginning* God created the Heavens and the Earth, does he mean *from for ever*, from the very first, or from Eternity? Why do they not perceive, that both *Moses* and *St. John* must be understood, as referring (in those words, *In the beginning*) to the Subjects of which they are writing: *John's* Subject is the Gospel-state and Oeconomy; the Subject of *Moses* is the Creation and the first Ages of Mankind; therefore *Moses* means only, in the beginning of the *World*; *John* means, in the beginning of the *Gospel-state*.

In the beginning *was the WORD*. He in-

tends here to say, In the beginning *was the Messias*, or *Christ*, whom the Jews, and from them we also have used to call *the WORD*.

'Tis not so easy to determine, with Certainty, why the Jews called the *Messias*, whom they expected, *the WORD*; but 'tis evident why *St. John* has been willing to comply with them, in giving that Name to the *Messias*: for as at *ver.* 7, 8, & 9. he calls our Saviour *the Light*, because he was the Bringer of the Gospel-light; so for the same reason he is content also to call him *the WORD*, because he was the Messenger of Glad-Tidings, the Bringer of the Gospel-Word, or of that new Revelation of the Divine Will, which is indifferently to be called the Gospel, or the Word of God.

This reason of the Name *the WORD*, given to our Saviour, is observed by *Origen*, and after him by *St. Chrysostom*, and is approved by *Maldonat*, *Beza*, *Gomarus*, *Dr. Hammond*, and other principal Interpreters among our Opposers.

The WORD was with God, and the WORD was God. Our Opposers themselves will not deny, because every Novice in Grammar knows it, that the original words should have been thus rendered, The *WORD* was with *the God*, and the *WORD* was a *God*. We claim this Translation as absolutely necessary for clearing the meaning of the Evangelist in this place. He saith not, the Word was *with God*, but with *the God*; because *ὁ Θεός* (or *the God*) is always used to signify the true God, or him who is God by way of Excellence and Appropriation, as Grammarians speak: but *Θεός* a God, is in Holy Scripture applied to Angels, to Kings, to Prophets, and to all such as any way represent the Person of him who is indeed God. Thus *Moses* is called and named a God, and that by God himself, *Exod.* 7. 1. because he was to represent the Person, and bring the Commands or Word of God to *Pharaoh*, and to the People of *Israel* and *Egypt*. *Moses* being called (by Confession of our Opposers) a God, on the

the fore-mentioned account; we ought not to be surprized, that this Evangelist has called the *WORD*, or *Messias*, a God, seeing he had the very same reason to call him so, that there was for *Moses* his being so called; for the *Messias* was no less than *Moses*, the Ambassador and Representative of God, and that also not to one or two Nations, but to all Mankind.

But whereas he here said to be (or have been) with the God; the meaning is, that before he entered on his Office, he was taken up into Heaven, to be fully instructed and informed in the nature and quality of his Office, and of that whole Charge which he was to deliver to Men. 'Tis in vain here, that our present Opposer Mr. *Milb.* demands, after a scoffing manner, at what time this Assumption into Heaven did happen; 'tis enough that we are told the thing by this Evangelist, and by our Saviour; we are not obliged to guess at the time, which the Scriptures have thought fit to conceal. The thing it self is plainly enough intimated in divers Texts of this Evangelist, *John* 3. 13. *No Man hath ascended into Heaven, but he that is come down from Heaven; even the Son of Man, who WAS in Heaven.* So that Text is translated by *Beza*, *Erasmus*, *Cambrinus*, and other Critics. *John* 6. 62. *What if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up whither he was before?* *John* 8. 38. *I speak that which I have seen with my Father.* See also *John* 6. 38, 51. It is true, the Evangelists have not recorded the particular Time or History of our Saviour's first Assumption unto God, as they have of his Transfiguration, his second Assumption, and other remarkable Passages of his Life: but the reason of that is, because they were Eye-witnesses of the latter, but the other happened before they were called to be Disciples, or to attend on him; and he himself never (as it should seem) told them of it, but only hinted it in some Discourses and Defences which he made to his Opposers. You see, Sir, there is no need of a *Chimerical* and imaginary, perpetual and

continual Generation of the Son, nor yet of an impossible mutual In-being of the Father and Son, for our understanding these words, *the WORD was with God*: the Difficulty is solved, after a natural and intelligible way; for the *WORD* was indeed with God, because he was taken up into Heaven, to be informed of all things appertaining to the Gospel-Dispensation; as *Moses* was called up into the Mountain, to be instructed in the Particulars of the Legal Dispensation; and as *St. Paul* was caught up into the third Heaven, to have Revelations and Visions necessary for the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Our Opposers do not find what to object to this Explication of the words, *the WORD was with God*; but to the other Interpretation, that the *WORD* was called a God, in the same sense only (or chiefly) that *Moses* was so called at *Exod.* 7. 1. they reply, this Evasion of the Socinians is set aside by the Description which *St. John* here adds, for he describes the *WORD* to be God, or a God, nor as *Moses* was, by Representation and Mission, but because *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made; and because the World was made by him.*

This was a bold Translation, they should at least have signified in the Margin, that the words might have been rendered; *For him were all things made, and without respect to him there was nothing made that was made; the World was made for him.* They know very well, I make Challenge to them to deny it, that the Greek Preposition which they have rendered *by*, might have been rendered *for*; so as to make the sense before-said even this, *For him were all things made, the World was made for him.* There is no Greek Lexicon but owns this Signification of that Preposition, when 'tis put (as here) before a Genitive.

'Tis enough to determine us which of the aforesaid Translations we ought to follow; that we know 'twas the Belief of the Jews, and is a most certain and undeniable Truth, that *all things were made for the Messias*;

that is, were at first made with intention to subject them in the fulness of Time, to the Messiah and his Law, *both* which God *intended* before he actually made the World. But we have besides for it this irrefragable Argument; that 'tis certain, there is but one Creator, and the one Creator is no other but God: seeing therefore the WORD is here distinguished from the God, (and thereby denoted to be the God) we are obliged to translate here, All things were made for him, the World was made for him; not the World was made by him, or all things by him.

I say, we are obliged thus to translate, or this Translation is necessary, on supposition that St. John speaks here of the *old* or first Creation; and the *lights* or material World. But the Socinians have hitherto supposed, that he speaks here of the *new* Creation and the *Spiritual* World; even that great Change of Affairs in the World, which hath been so considerable, that the Scriptures have divers times called it the *New Heavens* and the *New Earth*, as has been shown on Heb. 1. 10, 11. If these are the *All things*, and this the *World* intended by St. John; we admit the Translation of our Opposers, that All things were made by the WORD; for 'twas by his Ministry, that great Change of Affairs, called by the Jews, the *World of the Messiah*, was effected. If to this Interpretation, it be objected, that 'tis not very likely, that this Evangelist would lay such an occasion of Error in our way, as to say, all things were made by the WORD, and the World was made by him, if the WORD were not indeed the Maker of the World: because very few would apprehend that he spoke of a new Creation; and I know not what *World of the Messiah*. I confess the Objection is weighty, but it may be, (reasonably) answered, that the *New* Creation, the *Spiritual* World, and the *World of the Messiah*, was so universally known to the Jews, and also to the Christians, of those Times, who were all converted by Jewish Preachers, that St. John

reasonably expected to be readily understood by them. Especially considering, that but one God, and one only Creator, was then so well known to be the Doctrine of Christianity and of Judaism; that no one, who was at all acquainted with those Religions, would understand a Writer of either of those Persuasions, of any other Creation or World, but the *World of the Messiah* and the new Creation, when he attributed a Creation or World to any Person but God. In a word, St. John supposed, that he spoke safely and intelligibly, because writing his Gospel for the use of Jews and Christians, who knew the Doctrines of the Jewish Church concerning the Messiah; such must needs perfectly understand of what World he spoke, when he should say, *the World was made by the WORD*.

The short is, either St. John speaks here of the *old* Creation, and the *lights* World, and then we ought to render his words, All things were made for him, the World was made for him; which is an Allusion to a known saying of the Jews, that *the World was made for the Messiah*, namely, to subject it (in the fulness of Time) to the Messiah and his Law, a great and certain Truth: Or, he speaks of the *new* Creation, and the World which all men expected the Messiah should make; and if so, we understand him as saying, All things were made by him, and the World was made by him.

The rest is easy: The WORD *was made* *lights*, and *dwelt among us*: And, *As that cometh after us, is preferred before us, for he was before us*.

It will not be detided, Sir, by any of our Opposers, that instead of *The Word was made* *lights*, (that is, *lights* they, was made *Man*) we may render the Greek by the Word *WAS* *lights*, that is to say, *was* *Man*, or a Man. The Greek Word which, to serve the present turn, they render here by *was made*, is by themselves in this very Chapter rendered *WAS*, Ver. 6. *How WAS a Man sent from God, whose Name was John*.

It is plain enough; why our Opposers would take no notice, that St. John's words might be rendered *the Word WAS Flesh*; or, *was a Man, and dwelt among us*: for this Translation would have turned the whole Contest against them. It would have been perceived by All, that when the Word is before called a God, the meaning must be, he is a God as he represented the true God; and because (like *Moses*, who on the same Account is called a God, at Exod. 7. 1.) he is the Ambassador and Messenger of God, the bringer of the Commands and Word of God. Men would have discerned too, that they must not interpret St. John, as saying that the World (the Visible World) and all things were made by the WORD; but only for the WORD: Nay, this Translation, *the WORD was a Man*, would have contradicted them Directly and Expressly; for though they say Jesus Christ was a Man, yet the WORD (to which He was personally united) was *God*, and not Man, according to them.

But John Baptist has testified of the WORD; He is preferred before me, for *He was before me*. Here again the Translators have favoured themselves, by rendering the Greek words *WAS before me*; they might have been rendered, *IS before me*. But allowing their Translation, *Was before me*; Erasmus, Ortius, Beza, Maldonat, and other Critics observe, that the words are to be understood, of a *Priority of Dignity*, not a *priority of Time*; so as to make this Sense, He is preferred before me, tho' in regard of Time I am before him, because He was indeed before me in Excellence of Merit, and Dignity of Person and Office.

It is a very common thing with our Opposers, to pretend, that the Socinians cannot paraphrase this beginning of St. John's Gospel, without making such an *absurd sense*, as is next to ridiculous: therefore let us put all that has been said, into one view, in this following Paraphrase; and do you, Sir, and all Men judge, whether it be Harsh or Harcourt. "In the beginning of the Gospel-

"*State*, was the Messiah; whom the Jews have used to call the WORD: and we also may so call him, because He is the Great Messenger and Preacher of the Gospel-Word. This WORD was assumed into Heaven, and was there with God; to be instructed in all that he was to say and do, in the execution of the Office of the Messiah. He was with the God; and He himself was a God, being to represent the Person of God as his Ambassador, and to deliver his Commands and Word to Men: On which account very Many, and particularly *Moses*, are called Gods in Holy Scripture. The Messiah was decreed before the World was; nay, the World was at first made, with intention to subject it, in the fullness of Time, to the Messiah and his Law: So that the World, and all things may be said, to have been made for him; and that without regard to *Moses* had to him, nothing was made that was made. Yet as Great a Person as the Messiah is, this is always to be remembered, that *He was Flesh*, or Man, Man like to us, and that dwelt among us.

"I will say no more of him, at this time, but this; that *John the Baptist*, whom all Men took to be a Prophet, bore this Testimony of him: That tho' the WORD came after him, in respect of Time; yet the WORD was indeed before him, in the Excellence of his Person, the Dignity of his Office, and the Miraculous Power over Diseases and Devils, bestowed on him.

"What is there, Sir, in all this Paraphrase, that is not intelligible and easy? And for its Agreement with the Greek Text of St. John, we prove it by Rules of Criticism, not only not deniable by our Opposers, but advanced and urged by themselves.

It all depends upon these two Observations. First, Sometimes such as are meer Men, are, on the account of their Deputation and Mission from God, honoured with the Name of God: which we prove by the Example of *Moses*, (the Lawgiver of the Old Testa-

the Papists, 'tis on *Socinian Principles*, that the Scripture must be interpreted in confidence with *Evident Reason*; which is a yielding all the Controverted Points to the Socinians: But when they think fit to fall foul on the Socinians, 'tis on *Papist Principles*, that the Scripture must be interpreted by the Determinations and Decisions of Holy Mother-Church, as she is represented in General Councils, which are directed by the Holy Ghost: Which implies the yielding Transubstantiation and many other Points, to the Papists, who can show for them Councils as truly General, as any that can be al-

ledged for the Trinity of Incarnation.

In fine, such of our Opposers as are *Protestants*, must either come over to *Us*, or revolt to *Rome*: If they will not be obliged to interpret Scripture by Reason, they are obliged to turn Papists; for the Decisions of the Church in Councils, and the *very Letter of Scripture*, are against them: but if they admit no Interpretation of Scripture, but what is consistent with Reason, both They and the Papists must be Unitarians, because the Trinity and the Incarnation are contrary to, and inconsistent with Reason, much more than the Transubstantiation is.

CHAP. VI.

On the other Texts of St. John.

NEXT, He takes notice of some words of our Saviour, at *John 10. 30, 36, 38. I and my Father are one.*—*I am the Son of God.*—*The Father is in me, and I in him.* He saith; the Jews, from those words, *I and my Father are one*, did infer after this manner; *Thou being a Man, makest thyself God.* He adds; if the Jews mistook in the Inference they made, from those words; nothing can excuse, either our Saviour or his Apostles, from extrem Unkindness; since they would take no pains to rectify a Mistake, which in all appearance was involuntary.

A little more Defence would have become our Author, in making a Judgment, concerning what our Saviour or his Apostles ought to have done, towards rectifying the Mistakes of the Jews: And I think too, he needed not to be so concerned, on behalf of the poor Innocent Lambs the Jews; who only mistook (true Hearts;) and did not designedly pervert the words of our Saviour. On the contrary, I take it to be certain; that the Mistake of the Jews, was not

Involuntary, but Affected and Malicious; and however that be; yet our Saviour hath said enough, both in that Context and elsewhere, to rectify the Mistakes of any whomsoever, concerning his words, *I and the Father are one; I am the Son of God; the Father is in me, and I in him.*

Our Opposers ordinarily object to us; that the Jews understood those Expressions of our Saviour, as themselves do; namely, as signifying, that he professed himself to be God. But the Jews put a malicious Construction on our Saviour's words; that they might expose him to *Hatred and Persecution*. To be satisfied of this, we need only consider, that they came to him, with design to ensnare him in his words; as they had done oft-times before, and did many times afterwards. Let us hear what they say, v. 24. Then came the Jews round about him, and said to him; *How long dost thou make us to doubt? if thou be the Christ, tell us plainly.* To comprehend the true meaning of their putting this Question, we must look back to the foregoing Chapter, where, at *V. 22.* we

we are told, *The Jews had agreed already, that if any Man should confess, that He (Jesus) was the Christ, He should be put out of the Synagogue; &c.* He should be Excommunicated. We may add to this Observation; that by the Constitutions of that Church, every Person professing himself to be a Prophet, and not being really so, was to be put to death; much more if he pretended to be the Great Prophet of all, the Messiah or Christ. I say now, seeing they so perfectly persuaded themselves, that Jesus was not the Christ; that they resolved to Excommunicate any of their own Number, who should acknowledge him for the Christ; 'tis evident enough, that their Question, *Art thou the Christ?* was *injurious*, and designed only to get something from his own Mouth, on which they might Excommunicate him; nay, and proceed against him as a false Pretender, to be a *Prophet* and *Christ*. Can any one wonder, or reasonably doubt, that such Persons put a malicious Interpretation, on the words of his answer to them? And is it for Christians, to draw Arguments, nay, build *Articles of Faith* on the sense that such Persons made of our Saviour's words? and yet this is the great Argument of our Opposers, from this Context: The Jews say they understood our Saviour as saying that He was God: Why do They not take notice, that the Jews ascribed all him for no other Purpose; but to find Occasion against him, either by his own express Words, or by the Construction they could make of his Words?

But they say farther; our Saviour did not rectify the Mistake of the Jews. I know not, how it would help the Cause of our Opposers; if indeed it were so, that our Saviour had left the Jews in the hands of their own Malice, without caring to answer their groundless Cavils; provided He hath been careful, clearly to explain his Meaning to his Disciples, or others who in time to come might (happily) mistake him. But the Truth is, He doth in this very Context deny the Calumny of the Jews, that He made Himself (so He is in the Original) a God.

For He answers them at *Verf. 26. I say to of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World; Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?* The Unitarians may argue as strongly, from this Answer of our Saviour, as their Opposers have argued weakly, from the malicious Construction that his Adversaries made of his former words, *I and my Father are one.* *Disinstruct* Argument, to say, The Lord Christ is true God, for his Invererate Adversaries (who sought his Life) charged him with making himself a God: But we reason Unanswerably, when we say, the Lord Christ is the Messenger whom God has sent into the World, and not God himself; because He replies to the Jews, that God sanctified him indeed, and sent him into the World; and that He had never said of himself any higher thing, than this which is true of every good Man, *I am the Son of God.*

I will not now enter into a particular Discussion, what is the very Meaning of that *whole* Defence, which our Saviour there makes of himself in this Context; I conceive, that neither the Trinitarians nor Unitarians have hitherto comprehended all that our Saviour intended to say: But 'tis not necessary to inquire into a Matter, that will require a very long Discourse to clear it; because elsewhere our Saviour has interpreted all the Expressions, to which the Jews excepted, and at which others have so dangerously stumbled. They are these Three, *I and my Father are one; I am the Son of God; the Father is in me, and I in him.*

I and my Father are one. He saith as much of his Disciples; and explains to us, what we are to understand by the words, *John 17. 22. The Glory which thou hast given, (&c.) the Glory, or Honour of being the Ambassador of God to Men) I have given to them, (&c.) to my Disciples; that they may be One, as we are One.* Here our Lord declares to us, these Three Points; that He is One with the Father; that He hath made his Disciples also, to be One with the Father, and with himself; and in what regard it is, that He and They

They are one with the Father; not by an *Oneness*, or *Unity* of Persons, as the Sabellians held; nor by an *Oneness* of Nature or Godhead, as the Trinitarians hold; but by such an *Unity* or *Oneness* as is between the *Sinner* and the *Son*, the *Ambassador* and his *Principals*; namely, an *Oneness* of *Design* and *Intention*. For the sense of our Saviour there is plainly this: As thou hast made me to be one with thy self, even a Father and Son, in the same Design, the Design of reconciling Men to God; so have I made my Disciples to be one with us both, and with one another, by substituting them in my Place, and by employing and engaging them in the same Design. Again, he saith at *Mat. 17. Rep. these names thou hast given me, that they may be one, as we are*. As who should say, As thou Father and I are one, by our *Mutual Love*; to keep Those whom thou hast given me, in a like *Unity*, both with Us and among Themselves.

That it is then, that our Saviour is one with the Father (that is, with God) by an *Oneness* of Affection and Love, and by an *Oneness* of Design and Intention: and he teaches us at the same time; that there is the same *Unity* or *Oneness*, not only between the Father and himself on the one part; and all faithful Disciples on the other part; but also among the Faithful themselves.

Our Saviour having given us these *Rational* and *Natural* Senses of his words, *I and the Father are one*; the Socinians acquiesce in them, without erecting impossible and impious Schemes, such as an *Unity* of more Persons in one and the same numerical Godhead; they leave those things to such as are not contented with Scripture-Expressions, or with a Faith which is *Rational*, *Intelligible* and *Plain*; but must have *Mysteries* to amaze and confound their understandings, as if Faith were nothing but Ignorance, or Brutality, whereas the *Apostle* (on the contrary) defines or describes it to be *Reason*.

The Father is in me, and I in him. It is true, but he prays that all the Faithful may

have the same Privilege. *John 17. 21, 22. I pray—that they all may be one, as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee; that they may be one in us.* And the Critics have observed this following reading in ancient Copies, as *John 6. 56. He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him; as the Father is in me, and I in the Father.* Why and in what sense our Saviour saith, He was in the Father, and the Father dwelleth in him; and in what regard and respect, He desires and prays, that all such as believe in his Name, may be one in him and in the Father, is explained by this Evangelist, in his first Epistle, *1 John 3. 24. He that keepeth his (God's) Commandments, dwelleth in him, and he in him.* *1 John 4. 20. He that loveth his Body, dwelleth in him, and God in him.*

Our Saviour therefore, and all the Faithful, are said to be in the Father or God, by their *Obedience* and *Love*; and God is in them, by his *Mutual Love* to them. This is the Interpretation which the Scripture gives of it itself; we ought not to heed the Dreams or Fancies of *Artificial* Divinity, who think nothing is Religion, but what no body understands; and what contradicts Reason and good Sense.

Last of all, our Saviour also said, *I am the Son of God.* Every one confesses that he was so, because he was generated by the Divine Powers, on a Virgin, without the Concurrence of any other Father but God; yet even this, as great a matter as it is, is not so great a Glory to him, as that he was the Son of God in such sense, as all the Faithful are called God's Children, Sons and Daughters of God, begotten of God; namely, because of their *Similitude* and *Likeness* to God in Holiness or Purity, to which they have been brought by him, by his Word, and other Means suitable and adapted to their *Rational* Nature. *Mat. 5. 45. That ye may be the Children of your Father, which is in Heaven.* *1 John 3. 18. Whosoever loveth his Brother, abideth in him; so that is begotten of God, keepeth himself.*

Whereas.

Whereas therefore the Lord Christ is sometimes called the *only begotten* of the Father, it is to be understood, as when Isaac is called the *only* Son, and the *only begotten* Son of Abraham, at Gen. 22. 2, 12. Heb. 11. 17. Abraham had other Sons begotten by himself, yet Isaac is called his *only begotten* in regard of his Father's particular and especial Love to him, even such as Parents usually have for an only Child; And in this sense the Greek word (used concerning our Saviour) which we render *only begotten*, is frequently used in Greek Authors, and not only of such Person or Persons, as are strictly and in proper speaking *only begotten*.

In these Interpretations of the objected Clauses, *I and the Father are one*; *I am the Son of God*; *the Father is in me*, and *I in him*; we have the concurring Judgment of the principal Criticks and Interpreters among the Trinitarians: some of them do blame the Fathers for urging such Scripture-Expressions as these, against the Arians and Photinians; and they call the Interpretations of the Fathers, and of some Modern Writers of Controversies, *Violent Glosses*.

Our present Opposer was aware of this, and therefore is forced to say at P. 354. *We are not bound to regard what some Men of great Names say, or boldly assert*: It is true, but the Authority of such Men whose Names are (deservedly) great in Critical Learning, and especially in the sacred Criticism, doth at least evince thus much, that the Texts which they give up to their Opposers, ought to be placed in a Class by themselves, they ought to be reckoned among the Proofs that are brought for *show*, and Ostentation of Number, or to fill up the spare Pages of a Book, or in a popular Sermon, not in such a Book, wherein the Author professes to deal only with the Learned, and to urge no other Text but what is indeed an Argument on his behalf.

The *short* is, our Opposers litigate with us concerning the sense of these Expressions, *I and the Father are one*; *God is my Fa-*

ther; *I am is the Father, and the Father in me*: We show hereupon, from express Scriptures, that all these things are true of all the Faithful, and are said of them, no less than of our Saviour: We show farther, that they are interpreted in Holy Scripture, to be an *Onnisi* of Design and Love, an *Is-Being* by Obedience and Love on the part of the Lord Christ and Believers, and of Protection and Love on the part of God; and that the Lord Christ may be to the *Son* of God, and his *only Begotten*, as that still he is but a *Man*, and not *God*: We show that all this is confessed, tho' not by the *travailing* Pulpit, and *trifling* Systematicks and Catechists; yet by the chief Interpreters and Criticks, and just Reformers, even among our Opposers themselves. On the contrary, those that interpret the before-mentioned Expressions of our Saviour, as if in them he meant to say, that he is *God*; such do advance an Interpretation that destroys the Unity of God, contradicts manifest Reason, and has no Voucher but the *Jews*; I say, none but the *Jews*; for Trinitarians can produce no Text of Scripture, nor any Profane Author that can possibly be understood to mean by such Expressions what they mean, namely, a *numerical Onnisi* of Nature, an *Is-being* by *Abstracts* of Persons, and a *Natural Generation* out of the very *Essence* of God. Upon these Texts therefore we have as much advantage against them, as possibly we can have, even Reason, the Current of Scripture, the Authority of their own Criticks, and of all Profane Writers.

The next Trouble he gives us out of the New Testament, is, from John 20. 28. Thomas answered, and said unto him (unto Jesus) *My Lord, and my God*.

Scimus himself, Wolgemut and Stichtius, learned Unitarians, do not only grant, but they contend, that it was indeed the Intention of Thomas, to call our Saviour his *Lord*, and his *God*; but 'tis in no other sense than the Author of the 45th Psalm, calls Solomon *God*; *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*: To which he adds, speaking to the

the Queen concerning her Husband *Solomon*, *Harken, O Daughter, forget thy own People, and thy Father's House: So shall the King greatly desire thy Beauty; for he is thy Lord God, and worship thou him.* So 'tis in the Version of the Psalms, in the Book of Common-Prayer; which Translation, I judge, our Author will not disclaim. And so also *St. Jerome* translates, *Iste est Dominus Deus tuus, & adoratum eum*: but the Translators employed by King *James*, have left out the word *God*, from those words to the Queen, *He is the Lord thy God.* But seeing *Solomon* had before been called *God*, *Thy Thomas, O God, is for ever*: 'tis undeniable that in this Psalm he is called both *Lord and God*; and his Queen is bid to worship him, that is, to honour him; for such was the Language of the Eastern Nations to their Kings, and Persons in Eminent Dignity. The Prophets *Moses* and *Samuel* are called *Elohim*, or *God*, *Exod. 7. 1. 1 Sam. 28. 11, 13, 14.* In that last Context, King *Saul* ordered the Woman to call up *Sanna*; and *Samuel* appearing, she called to *Saul* and told him, that now she saw *Elohim* (*God*) ascending up. *Saul* thereupon asks her, *What form is he of?* the Woman replies, *He is an old Man.* It appears by this, that besides their Kings and Magistrates, the Jews gave also the Name *Elohim* to the Prophets. But that was the very word used by the Apostle *Thomas* to our Saviour; the Greeks translate it by *Gods*, the English by the word *God*. Therefore when 'tis used of a *Man*, we are not to suppose, that the Speaker intends to call such *Man God*; or that he owns him for a Person who is *true God*; but he uses it in such sense, as the Jews and other Eastern Nations used it; for a Person of Eminent Dignity, or Worth. The Woman said of *Samuel*, then rising out of the Earth, I see *Elohim, God*: *Thomas* says of our Saviour, newly also risen, *Eloi, Eloi, my God, my God*; they both use the same word, and one no more than the other in-

tended to call the Person of whom he spoke, the *true God*, but only a venerable, or dignified Person. To be short, the Hebrew words *El* and *Elohim*, the Syriac and Chaldaic *Elohi*, *Eloi*, and the Greek *Gods*, all which we render by the English *God*, are words of just such a Latitude in Holy Scripture, and among the Jews and other Oriental Nations, as the word *LORD* is with us; for we use that word indifferently, sometimes of *God*, sometimes of Persons in Dignity, and leave our meaning to be judged by the true and known Quality of the Person to whom we speak. We do not think or fear we shall be understood, as making a *Man* to be *God*, because we call him by a Name by which also we call *God*. This is the very case before us, *Thomas* says to our Saviour *Eloi*, a Name used of *God* and of Persons in Dignity; and he expected not to be mistaken, because the Person to whom he spoke was known to be a *Man*, and not *God*.

'Tis likely the before-mentioned is the true Interpretation of the objected Texts; and 'tis certainly so, if *Thomas* meant those words to our Saviour: But divers Learned Persons, even among our Opposers, have been of Opinion, that *My Lord, and my God* (or, O my Lord! O my God!) are only words of Admiration and Thanks directed (not to our Saviour, but) to *God*; they are an Exclamation, expressing the Apostle's Wonder and Amazement to find that his Master was indeed risen. Of this Opinion was *Nisarius* Archbishop of *Constantinople*, and that most Learned Person *Theodorus of Mopsust*. 'Tis true, the Evangelist saith, *Thomas answered, and said unto him, (unto Christ) My Lord, and my God! or, O my Lord! O my God!* but this hinders not, but that the Exclamation was addressed to *God as its Object*, tho it was also an Answer to our Saviour, and to what he had said at *ver. 27.* See the *Brief History of the Unitarians*, on *John 20. 28.*

CHAP. VII.

On the Texts out of the Epistles.

HE thinks much weight may be laid on Rom. 9. 5. *Of whom, as concerning the Flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.* Like to which Text is Rom. 1. 3. *Jesus Christ our Lord, who was made of the Seed of David, according to the Flesh.*

He saith hereupon, that these words, *According to the Flesh*, and, *as concerning the Flesh*, intimate plainly, that according to something else the Lord Christ had another Original, and was not wholly of the Jews. This something else is the (supposed) Divine Nature of our Saviour; according to which, say they, he is derived from God; as according to the *Flesh*, he is from the Jews.

Our present Author notes farther, that the Lord Christ in the former of the before-quoted Texts, is not only expressly called God, but God over all, blessed for evermore; so all the Original Greek Copies read. And as for Translations, if there are any which favour the Socinians, they are not however much to be regarded. I answer,

1. As to the words, *As concerning the Flesh*, and *According to the Flesh*, they never signify, as Trinitarians would here interpret, according to the Human Nature, as if Christ had also a Divine Nature. We shall easily find the meaning of those Phrases, by some other Texts of Scripture, in which there is no Ambiguity: Rom. 9. 3. *My Kinsmen according to the Flesh.* Rom. 4. 1. *Abraham our Father, as pertaining to the Flesh.* Col. 3. 22. *Servants, obey in all things your Masters according to the Flesh.* Will our Opposers say here, that Abraham, or Paul's Kinsmen, or Masters, must be supposed to have a Divine Nature, because of these words, *According to the Flesh*, and *As concerning the Flesh*? 'tis easy to see, that these Expressi-

ons are only as much as to say, *According to the Body*; and that they signify to us, that Abraham is the Father of the Jews, according to their Bodies, as God is the Father of their Souls and Spirits; and the Jews were, Paul's Kinsmen, according to the Body, but not of Kin to him in respect of Likeness, in Faith or Manners: also that Masters are Masters over our Bodies, not of our Spirits and Minds. Therefore in the other Texts also, where Christ is said to be the Seed of Abraham, of Israel and of David, according to the *Flesh*: the real and whole meaning is this, That according to his Body or outward Man, he descended of the House of David, and of the Stock of Israel and Abraham, as had been promised concerning him in the Prophets, but his Spirit or Soul was from God. Here again we interpret Scripture by it self: let our Opposers shew a Reason why they decline an Interpretation which the Scripture it self affords to us, and how it comes to be Heresy, to understand the meaning of one Text, by the help of such other Texts as are consents to be clear and evident?

2. He saith, the former of these Texts expressly calls the Lord Christ God, and God over all, blessed for ever; and that all Greek Copies agree in this reading. But he might have taken notice out of Grotius, that the Greek Copies used by the Author of the Syriac, had not the word God; they only say of our Saviour here, *the Blessed over all*. The same illustrious Interpreter observes, that Erasmus had noted, that the Copies of St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, and St. Chrysostom, had only *the Blessed over all*, or above all, without the word God. These are Observations which destroy our Author's Argument from this Text; but because he knew

not what to say to them, he took no notice of them: But it is an impious thing for a Writer, to endeavour to *cheat* his Reader in such Questions as these. When it appears by so great Authorities, that the Ancient Reading was *either* ways than we read in our present Copies; or that the reading was then *various* and *uncertain*; how can such Texts, or such Expressions be admitted as *Proofs*, in to great a Question as this before us? Is it advisable or safe, to argue against the Unity of God, or to build Articles of Faith on *suspected* Texts? The Reading ought to be *indubitable*, else the Inference drawn from it, will also be *uncertain*. An Article of Faith must have a sure Foundation, else 'tis not *Faith*, but a *precarious Conjecture*.

3. But allowing now, that the Word *God* is highly read in this Text; two of the most eminent Critics, and principal Masters in the Greek Tongue, have observed, that St. Paul's words should have been *pointed*, and read after this manner: *Of whom as concerning the Flesh, Christ is come: The God over all be blessed for ever. Amen.* So *Circellius* and *Erasmus* translate here. According to this Rendering, our Saviour is not here called *God over all*; but the Apostle gives Thanks to God over all, for his unspeakable Gift, our Lord Christ.

Our Author saith, that if there be any Translations of this Text, which favour the Socinians, they are *not much to be regarded*: But this is an Answer, fitter for an *Old Woman* to make, than for a Writer in these Questions. Seeing He undertakes to confute the Socinians, he ought to have shown, that the Translation which confirms their Doctrine, is some-way faulty: He should have answered the *Critical Reason*, which *Erasmus* and *Circellius* give of their Translation. They observe, that if the words [*God over all*] had been intended of our Lord Christ; the Apostle should have said in the Greek, *ὁ θεός*, not *ὁ κύριος*: and I doubt not that our Author was aware that those Critics were in the right; and therefore he willingly overlook'd both the Translation, and the Reason of it.

If you, Sir, say to me, this being a *Critical Dispute*, how should an *Unlearned Man* be able to judge, which of the two Senses was intended by the Apostle? What Ground can such a one have to say, the Trinitarian Translation is not Good? Yes, he is as much qualified to judge, as the most Learned. For seeing the words may be (confessedly by both Parties) rendered two ways, he may be sure, that is the true Reading and Rendering, which agrees with *Evident Reason*, and with the rest of Scripture: both which allow of but one Person, who is *God over all*; and if there were more such Persons, there must of necessity be more Gods. This Reasoning directs him, which Side he is to take; not only in this Question, but in all other Questions: Whatsoever the Question is, if a Text or Texts be alleged, that may be translated several ways; that is the true Translation, which is firm'd by *evident Reason*, and other *clear Texts*; and that is a *false* Translation, which would introduce an Opinion contrary to Reason, or to other *indisputable* Texts. Therefore the Faith of the Unlearned, may be as certain and well-grounded, as the Faith of the greatest Critic: for either other clear and indisputable Texts, or a demonstrative Reason, presents it self, and dissolves the Difficulties.

And if this were not so, it would not be the Duty of the Unlearned; nay, 'twould be contrary to their Duty, to be of any Persuasion or Party at all; such must neither be Protestants nor Papists, Socinians nor Trinitarians, Remonstrants nor Calvinists, nor of any other Sect, because of this Pre-*tence*, that they cannot make a *critical* Judgment of different Translations. But no Party will dare to say this: therefore say I, the Unlearned may, and have a right to be of a particular Side and Persuasion; on this Account, that by help of *clear Texts*, or of *evident Reason*, they may in all Questions easily discern, which Side they ought to take. I will add, that oft-times the *Unprejudiced* and *Judicious* unlearned Person,

sees farther and clearer, than the *Interested, Prejudiced and Unjudicious Critic*, or other Learned Person. But of this I have said enough, in that General Preface to some of our Pamphlets; which has this Title, *An Exhortation to a Serious and Impartial Enquiry*: where I show, that this is the very Principle on which the Reformation proceeded; and that in taking it away, the Reformation must fall, and we must all return to *Rome*.

His last Scripture-Allegation is from *Phil. 2. 6, &c.* Let this Mind be in you, which was in Christ Jesus: who being in the Form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took on him the Form of a Servant; and was made in the Likeness of Man; and being found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name above every Name.

Mr. *Aslib.* has said but very little on this Context; Others of his Party have made advantage of almost every Clause thereof. The Lord Christ, say they, was in the Form of God: What can that mean, but that *He* was God? for the Form of a thing, is the very Nature of it. And that this is a true Interpretation, we certainly know by the next words, which say; *He thought it not robbery to be equal with God*: Had He not been God, it had been the greatest Robbery and Sacrilege possible, to think himself equal with God. 'Tis true, He humbled himself, and took on him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of Men, and was found in fashion as a Man, and became obedient to the Death of the Cross. But even these very Expressions are such, as plainly intimate, that all this was nothing else but his *Condescension*; He stoop'd to these things, only because for great and weighty Reasons He was pleas'd to do so. Of those Reasons (or Ends) the Apostle here mentions one, *to set us an Example*: Let that Mind (saith he) be in you, which was in Christ Jesus; who being in Great a Person, yet humbled himself to

take the Form of a Servant, and was made in the likeness of Men.

I will here, Sir, tell you a Story. A certain Country-man that hap'd to live in a Parish, where the Minister used to insist very often on these Questions, about the Divinity and the Incarnation of our Saviour, turn'd down in his Bible the Proofs alledged by his Minister; and being a Man, though of no Learning, yet of a Good Capacity, he found at length how to satisfy himself of the Insufficiency of all the Minister's Proofs, on behalf of the Divinity of our Saviour: only he was puzzled with this Context out of the *Philippians*, that Christ was in the Form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, &c. After much thinking, he imagin'd that he could give a reasonable Account even of this Context, all but that one Expression, *He thought it not robbery to be equal with God*. Here he stuck; for if Christ be equal with God, sure he is (as the Church says) a Person of God, or of the Deity, and the Trinitarian Doctrine must be true. At length, it came into his mind, that there might be some Error in the Translation; and therefore he ask'd his Minister, Whether the words were altogether so in the *true Bible*, (so he call'd the Original Greek) as they are in the English Bible: I suspect, says he, that the word *It* (in this Clause, he thought it not robbery to be equal with God) is not in what you use to call the Original, and out of which you often correct our way of reading in the English Bibles; I judg that the Apostle said only, *He* (Christ) thought not robbery to be equal with God. The Minister was forced to confess, that *It* was not in the Greek; and that it should have been printed, as the words of *Supplements* usually are, in a different Character from the rest of the Verse. But then, Sir, says the Country-man; If the Apostle says, that Christ thought not robbery to be equal with God, it should seem, it would indeed have been robbery, if he had thought himself equal with God: So that the Apostle's meaning will

will be this; "Jesus Christ conceived not
 " this thing (this Robbery and Sacrilege, in
 " his mind, to be equal with God, or that
 " he was equal with God.

This is my Tale; I assure you, Sir, I do
 not make it, I had it from a Friend of
 Yours, whose Veracity you will not ques-
 tion: So true is it, that after all the
 wretched Disguisings of Holy Scripture, by
 Translations grossly false, an industrious and
 sagacious Enquirer, though Unlearned, may
 by himself enquire out the great Truth of
 Christianity, *the Unity of God*. I confess,
 such have an hard Task, because our Op-
 posers have never owned in their Margin,
 any other Reading or Rendering in the Texts
 controverted between them and us, but on-
 ly that which they have *construed* to serve
 their own Turns: But by the Story I have
 told you, it appears not to be impossible to
 find Truth, even without the help of a bet-
 ter Translation.

Mr. *Milburn* says, at *Page 374*. that this
 Context of the Apostle to the *Philippians*, is
 so clear for the Divinity of our Saviour,
 that Trinitarians may refer themselves con-
 cerning this Matter, to the *merest Stran-
 ger to Christianity*, that has but read this
 Context. For what can be more plain?
He was in the Form of God, He thought it
 not robbery to be *Equal with God*; He
 humbled himself to take the *Form of a Ser-
 vant*, and the *Likeness and Fashion of a Man*.
 In short, a *Heathen* would say, that the
 Person of whom these things are spoken,
 must undoubtedly be more than *Man* or *Crea-
 ture*.

This (he thinks) is a home Charge on
 the Socinians; but our Country-man would
 have made our Author to abate a great deal
 of his Assurance: He would tell him, 'tis
 true, Sir, the Lord Christ *was in the Form
 of God*; but so also are all other Men; the
 Holy Scriptures inform us, that *Adam* and
 all other Men, are made in the Similitude,
 Form or Likeness of God. Which is so
 far from proving, that *Adam*, or Christ,
 are God, or a Person of God, that it de-

monstratively proves, that neither of them is
 God; because what are *like*, are never the
same. 'Tis true, our Blessed Saviour was
 more in the Form, Fashion, or Likeness of
 God, than any other Man: for besides all
 that Resemblance that we have to God, by
 our *Reason*, our *Superiority* over the Crea-
 tures, the immortal *aching Nature* of our
 Souls; besides all this, He had a more per-
 fect Holiness, and a Power and Authority
 over Devils, Diseases, the Winds and Seas;

and this Form of God was given to the
 Lord Christ, that he might confirm by his
 Miracles that Holy Doctrine which he was
 to deliver from God to Men. Thus the *Coun-
 try-man* would enlighten Mr. *Milburn's* *Hea-
 then*; concerning the first Expression, *He
 was in the Form (or Likeness) of God*.

But then the *Heathen* would say farther;
*He (Christ) thought it not robbery to be
 Equal to God*.

You are mistaken, good Sir, says the
 Country-man, for our Apostle's words are,
He thought not robbery to be Equal with God:
 Of which, the plain meaning is; He was
 not so Sacrilegious, as to think in his Mind,
 that because he had some *likeness* to God,
 a far greater than any Man, or (perhaps)
 Angels, therefore He was *Equal with God*.
 Because though He was so highly in the
Form of God, yet he remembereth what he saith
 elsewhere, *All Power is GIVEN to me*,
Matth. 28. 18. But on the contrary, the
 Power of him who is *true God*, is not *given*,
 but is originally his own, the result of his
 own Eternal Nature.

As for those Expressions, *He made himself
 of no Reputation*, and *took on him the Form
 (or Likeness) of a Servant*; they are thus
 to be understood: He declined the Esteem
 and Reputation of this World, by conceal-
 ing the Miracles which he did; charging
 (oft-times) those that were healed, not
 to divulge the Matter: Nay, He took on him
 the Form of a Servant, by suffering Injury
 and Reproach, without answering again;
When he was reviled, he reviled not again.

The Apostle adds, *That being in the likeness of Men, and found in fashion as a Man, he humbled himself to the Death of the Cross.* At these words begins a new sense, neither is the word (*And*) prefixed to them in the Greek; their meaning is this. "Farther, tho Christ was in the Likeness or Form of God, by the extraordinary Power and Authority granted to him; yet because he remembered, that he was made in every respect in the common *Likeness* and *Fashion* of all other Men, *Like to his Brethren in all things, Sin excepted*; therefore upon all occasions he readily humbled himself; He even submitted himself to be taken, and crucified by the Jewish and Roman Magistracy, tho He could most easily have delivered himself from them, because He knew that by that kind of Death God should be greatly glorified, and the Gospel confirmed. On this account, as well as on some others, God has highly exalted him, and given to him the Name above every Name, *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* Rev. 19. 16.

Mr. *Milb.* craftily supposes, that his *Heathen* should conclude for the Divinity of our Saviour, from this only Context to the *Philippians*, without being before acquainted with Christianity, or with Scripture: but why is He afraid to let his *Heathen* be acquainted with Christianity and with Scripture, but only with this Text? is it not because the Christian Profession of *but one God*, and the express words of our Saviour, *My Father is greater than I*; and again, *I ascend to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God*: Is it not (I say) because the knowledge of these other Texts, and very many the like, would make his *Heathen* to interpret this place to the *Philippians*, as the Country-man did? But he knows besides, that some of the principal Interpreters and Critics of his own Party, have given up to the Unitarians this Context of St. Paul to the *Philippians*; they ingenuously own, that this whole Discourse of the Apostle was by him intended of our Lord Christ,

as Man, and not as God: He may see a considerable Collection of Authors, *Fathers* as well as *Moderus*, who make this honest Confession: In *Chr. Sandius* his Interpret. Paradox, p. 359, 360. Among the rest there cited, *M. Lath.* (*de dupl. Justit.*) is very express and clear.

Let us, if you please, Sir, lay the whole Interpretation before given into one view, that the Reader may more easily make a Judgment of it. "Let such a Mind be in you, O *Philippians*! as was in the glorious Head and Captain of our Salvation, the Lord Christ. For He being in the Likeness or Form of God, by an extraordinary Sanctity, and a miraculous Power over Diseases and Devils, conferred on him by God; He did not (like *Lucifer*) conceive in his Mind that Impiety and Robbery to be equal with God: but (on the contrary) He made himself of no Reputation, and took the Likeness of a Man of Servile Condition, by concealing the great Miracles which he did, and by bearing Injuries and Reproaches, without answering again. Being made in the Likeness of all other Men, and found in the common Fashion of a Man; He submitted to be taken by the Jews, and to undergo the Death of the Cross, for the Glory of God, and the Salvation of Men. And because He was thus affected towards God's Honour, and the Good of Men; therefore has God highly exalted him, making him Head of the Church, both that in Heaven, and that on Earth; and giving to him that Name above every Name, *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords.* But hitherto of the Concertation between Mr. *Milbourn's* *Heathen* and our Country man; I submit to the Reader, which of them has best understood St. Paul.

But I desire you, Sir, to consider, what wild Work our Opposers make with these Words and this Context of St. Paul; and how they make no scruple to render him guilty of the most palpable Self-Contradictions in one and the same Breath. The Lord Christ,

Christ; saith this Apostle, *was in the Form of God*; that is, say our Opposers, he had the very Nature of God, or was truly and really God; and *He thought it not Robbery* (so They make the Apostle to speak) *to be equal with God*. Now, if He was God, how could He be equal with God? for nothing is ever said to be equal with itself; Equality and Likeness must be between several and divers things.

Well, He was God, and was equal with God, and yet made himself of no Reputation, took on him the Form of a Servant, was made in the likeness and fashion of Man; nay, humbled himself to Death, even the Death of the Cross. But 'tis both Morally and Physically, or naturally impossible, that God should do any of these things, undergo any of these Changes. Why do they not perceive, that He who is true, God, cannot make himself of no Reputation; or take the Form of a Servant, the Likeness and Fashion of

Men; or submit himself to Death?

The Apostle goes on, *Wherefore God hath also highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name*. O strange! God exalts God, and gives to him (which implies that He had it not before) a Name above every Name. I would know, what Name could be given to him above the Name he had before?

I do not pretend, Sir, that they own this Interpretation in the very terms I have here set down; but this I say, that admitting their Hypothesis, that the Lord Christ is true God; this and no other was, I must not say the Apostle's Sense, but his meaning it was. You may please, Sir, to compare it with that easy and natural Paraphrase of the Socinians, which was before mentioned, and then tell me, which of them would be chosen even by a (sensible) Heathen, to whom our Opposer has thought fit to make his Appeal.

CHAP. VIII.

On what he objects from the Actions or Miracles of our Saviour.

AFTER he has done with particular Texts, our Author (from P. 381.) spends some Sheets in recounting certain Actions of our Saviour, by which it may appear that he was true God, that one true God whom the Scriptures every where propound to us, as the only legitimate Object of Faith and Worship. He saith, for instance, our Saviour did many wonderful Miracles, and that too in his own Name, nor as the Minister or Instrument of another, but in a commanding way; as when he rebuked the Winds and Waves, and cast out Devils. He healed Diseases by a Virtue issuing from himself; as appears by the Woman who was cured by only touching his Garment, and by his own

words thereupon, *Virtus is gone out of me*. Nor did he cure only the Distempers of the Body, but those of the Mind and Soul; for he invited to him the *Leary and heavy-laden*, promising that he would give them Rest; which is a sort of Language never used by any Prophet, or meer Man: nay, he forgave to divers their Sins, which ('tis certain) only God can do.

As a further Display of his Divinity, 'tis said of him, *He knew what was in Man*; and he saith of himself, *I am He who searcheth the Reins and Heart*. There can be no greater Omniscience than this, nor can Omniscience belong to any but God.

After his Resurrection, He opened the Understandings of his Disciples.

He breathed on them, and thereby conferred the Holy Spirit; which being God's Inspiration, even in the Opinion of the Socinians, How can it be given by any but God?

Afterwards He himself shed on them the same Holy Spirit in a miraculous manner, when he caused the Spirit to descend on them, in the likeness of cloven Tongues: but if he were not God, how should he give the Spirit of God to others?

They are his own words to his Disciples, *As my Father sent me, so send I you*; but that could not be said by him, if he had not the same Authority (or were not equal) with the Father.

After his Ascension his Disciples did their Miracles in his Name, or only by Faith in him; but no meer Man can enable another to do Miracles; nor can Faith in a meer Man avail to that purpose.

Lastly, He sent St. Paul to be a Minister to the Gentiles, to convert them to God; that so, saith he, they may have Remission of Sins, and an Inheritance among those who are sanctified by Faith in me; or by believing in me. And in doing all this, saith he farther to that Apostle, *I will deliver thee from the People, and the Gentiles, to whom I send thee*; Acts 26. 16, 17, 18. Mr. Milb. seems to think there is a great Force in these Allegations, towards the evincing that the Lord Christ was indeed God; and with these Proofs he concludes his present Argument from Scripture. Let us examine what he hath said, part by part.

He saith, first, our Saviour did Miracles in his own Name, not as the Minister or Instrument of another. But this is not the Language of Scripture; the express words of our Saviour, and the whole current of Scripture are against it. John 5. 43. *I am not sent of my self.* John 5. 30. *I can do nothing of my self.* Mat. 12. 28. *I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God.* John 14. 10. The

Father that dwelleth in me (to wit, by his Spirit) he doeth the Works. Acts 2. 22. *Jesus of Nazareth, a Man approved of God among you, by Miracles, Wonders and Signs which God did by him in the midst of you.* Assuredly these Texts declare as evidently as in words can be done, that the Lord Christ was no more than the Instrument and Minister of God, and of his Spirit, in working Miracles; and that it was in the Father's Name, not in his own, that he appeared and acted.

But he healed Diseases by a Virtue issuing from himself; for he saith, *Virtue is gone out of me.* That there was a Balsamick and Sanative Virtue in the Body of our Saviour, I will not deny; but neither can it be denied, that the like Virtue was also given by God to the Bodies of some of the Apostles: for Handkerchiefs from their Bodies, and their Shadows healed many, Acts 5. 15. & 19. 12.

Nor is there any more Force in that, that the Lord Christ invites to him the Heavy-laden, promising to give them Rest to their Souls. For he gave Rest to Souls sensible of the Guilt and Burden of Sin, by his Doctrine; which every Gospel-Preacher may do, nay, ought to do. A Gospel-Preacher is to declare to the Sensible and Penitent, the Forgiveness and Absolution of God, and thereby gives them Rest and Peace.

But 'tis marvellous that this Author should urge it as a Proof of our Saviour's Divinity, that He declared to some Persons, whose Faith appeared in visible Acts of Piety and Trust in God, that their Sins were forgiven; for sure he knows what is said to the Apostles at John 20. 23. *Whose Sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose Sins ye retain, they are retained.* Let him show, if he can, that our Saviour ever claimed any higher Authority or Power than the Apostles are here vested with, by Command from God. But I think it were not hard to prove, that in all these Texts, the word Sins is put for the Effect of Sins, even Diseases, so as to make this sense; that our Saviour

Saviour and his Apostles had Authority and Power, either to loose Men from their Infirmities and Ails, or to leave them in them, as they should see reason and cause, either for the *Spiritual* Benefit of the Person, or for Confirmation of the Gospel, by such Signs and Wonders.

Our Lord Christ *knew what was in Man*, saith the Evangelist St. John. But he doth not say, that he knew it of himself, by a Natural Omniscience, without Revelation from God.

The Prophet *Ahijah* knew what was in the Mind of the Queen of *Israel*, 1 Kings 14. 6. *Elisba* knew what his Servant *Gehazi* had done, and what he purposed, 2 Kings 5. 22. The same Prophet knew the Counsels that the King of Syria took against the King of *Israel*, 2 Kings 6. 9, 12. He told *Hezekiah*, not only what was in his Heart, but what should be there in time to come, 2 Kings 8. 12. The Holy Scriptures do not expressly say, that the Knowledge which these Prophets had of *what was in Man*; or, what is the same thing, the secret Thoughts of their Hearts, was only *derivative*, or by God's Revelation: They supposed there was no need to instruct or warn the Reader concerning a matter that was self-evident. But, as if foreseeing the monstrous Doctrine that some would advance concerning the great Minister and Prophet of the New Testament, the Lord Christ; and designing to arm the Faithful against it; they have been careful to tell us *directly* and *explicitly*, that the Prophetick Knowledge that was in him, was derivative, or by Revelation from God, not from himself, or by a Natural Omniscience of his own. Rev. 1. 1. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him, to shew unto his Servants things that must shortly come to pass. And He (Christ) sent and signified it by his Angel (or, by his Messenger) to his Servant John.* How can a considering Man doubt, that if our Saviour knew the things which must very shortly come to pass, only by God's Revelation of them to him; that his Knowledge

too of what was in the Hearts and Minds of Men, must be also by God's Revelation, or the Inhabitation of the Spirit of God in him?

But our Author urgeth, that the Lord Christ saith, *I am He which searcheth the Reins and Hearts*: Rev. 2. 23.

He ought to know, that to *search the Heart and Reins*, is an Hebrew and Scripture Phrase and form of speaking, and signifies no more but this, *to know the most secret Thoughts and Purposes of the Mind and Heart*. This is a Property that can belong only to God, to know (or, as the Hebrew speaks, to *search*) the Hearts and Thoughts, if you mean thereby, *originally*, or of himself, or by his own natural and proper Omniscience: but the Prophets, and more especially the Lord Christ, know the Hearts and Reins by God's Revelation to them, and search the Thoughts by the inhabiting Spirit of God in them. When therefore our Saviour saith here, *I search the Hearts*, he meant this, *I know the Thoughts of the Heart, by God's Revelation to me, or by his inhabiting Spirit in me*. In a word, God only knoweth the Thoughts of the Heart, and *what is in Man*, originally, of himself, or by his own proper and natural Omniscience: But Prophets search or know the Hearts, and what is in Man, *derivatively*, by God's Revelation to them, by his inhabiting Spirit in them. We are assured that this last only was our Saviour's meaning, in these words, *I search the Hearts*, by the first words of this Book of Revelation, before quoted, even these, *The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave to him*. There could be no need that God should make a Revelation to him, if he himself knew the Reins and Hearts by a natural Omniscience of his own.

We are not therefore to stick at the mere words, *I search the Heart*, but to consider the Import or Sense of that Phrase in the Scripture-Language; which signifying only this, *to know the Thoughts of the Heart or Mind*; they do not prove the Person of whom they are spoken, to be Omni-

Omniscient, or God; unless it had been said He searcheth (or He knoweth) the Hearts by his own Omniscience, and not (as 'tis said of our Saviour) by Revelation from God, or God's inhabiting Spirit.

When the Lord Christ opened the Understandings of the two Disciples, that they might understand the Scriptures; this was not an Act of his Power, but the Effect of the Discourse he made to them: He opened their Understandings, to understand the Prophetic Scriptures, by explaining those Scriptures to them.

He conferred a Measure of the Holy Spirit, by the External Sign of *breathing on the Disciples*. We can no more infer from hence that he was God, than that the Apostles also were so many Gods, because they gave the Spirit by the External Sign of *laying on their Hands*; Acts 19. 6. The latter was as great a Miracle as the former, and both of them the effect of God's Power, not of Man's.

But 'tis false, what our Author here adds; that our Lord Christ did *Himself shed on them the Holy Spirit*, when he caused the Spirit to descend on them in the form of Cloven Tongues. The Apostle indeed saith, *He (Christ) hath shed forth this* (this miraculous Participation of the Spirit) *which ye now see and hear*: But he saith not, as our Author reports his words, *He himself hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear*; for it was not He himself, but He by the Gift of God, that shed forth the Spirit on them. Let us hear the whole Verse, Acts 2. 23. *Therefore He (Christ) bring by the right Hand of God exalted; and having received (or obtained) of the Father, his Promise of the Holy Ghost; He hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear*. Here indeed the Spirit is said to be shed forth by the Lord Christ on the Apostles, but not by Him himself; but He shed it forth, *having* (saith the Text) *received it of the Father*. As who should say, having received this Power from the Father, which afterwards the Apostles also received of the Father, even the Power of

confering the Spirit: He now shed it forth on them; not He himself, by his own Authority or Power, but by the Warrant, Order, Grant or Commission of the Father. If our Saviour had conferred the Spirit on his Disciples, by his own Power or Authority, it would not have been said; that *having received of the Father his Promise of the Holy Ghost, he shed it abroad on his Followers*.

Let our Opposers show, that the Lord Christ was more than the Instrument, Minister and Mediator, by Whom, and at whose Instance, God shed forth the Spirit: neither this, nor any other Context ascribes more to him; and as much as is elsewhere ascribed to the Apostles, Acts 10. 44. Acts 19. 6.

They are words which our Saviour speaks to his Disciples; *As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you*. But it follows not from hence, that the Authority and Power of Christ, was equal to the Power and Authority of the Father: nay, the contrary rather follows; for the Messenger is but the Minister and Servant of the Sender.

After Jesus was ascended into Heaven, his Disciples did their Miracles *in his Name*; and by Faith in him. Acts 3. 6. *In the Name of Jesus of Nazareth, rise up and walk*. Ver. 16. *His Name, through Faith in his Name, hath made this Man strong*.

We confess hereupon, that Miracles were done by the Name, or in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and through Faith in his Name: But how does this prove that he was God? Such Miracles prove indeed, that the Person in whose Name they are done, is a most Powerful and Effectual Mediator with God, but not that He himself is God; they prove, that he is acceptable to God; and that what he desireth, that also God willeth; but not that he is the true & proper Author of those Miracles. 'Tis a particular Honour that God is pleased to do to the Lord Christ, that in his Name Wonders should be done; and that some who believed in his Name, should.

should on that account be enabled to do Miracles; But when our Opposers infer from hence, therefore Christ is God, this is no *Necessary* or *Natural* Consequence; because nothing hinders but that God may confer the same Honour on any other Person or Thing. Not, secondly, is it a true Consequence; because we are assured, by innumerable *express* and *clear* Testimonies, that the Lord Christ is not God. As, 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Jesus Christ.*

Finally; Our Lord promis'd, that he would deliver his Apostle from the People, and from the Gentiles; and declares, that we are *justified by Faith in his Name*, or by believing in him, *Acts* 26. 17, 18, &c. He delivered indeed that Apostle, from very many Machinations of the Jews, and Conspiracies of the Gentiles; but all this as

Mediator, not as God: by his Intercession, which (as this Apostle saith) *he ever liveth to make*, on behalf of all the Faithful; and more especially of such as are *extraordinarily* commissioned to the Work of propagating the Gospel in Heathen Nations, as St. Paul was.

As to our being *justified* (i. e. made Holy) by *Faith in Christ*, or by believing in him, it was never questioned, I think, by any; but the meaning of the Expression is only this, that such as sincerely believe the Lord Christ, and the Gospel or Doctrine by him delivered, do *justify themselves*; they refrain from every Evil Work and Word; their Faith does dispose and incline them, of its own Nature and Tendency, to Sanctification and Holiness; this is the only meaning of our being *justified by Faith in Christ*.

CHAPTER IX.

On what is alledged from the Fathers.

OUR Author passes from *sacred Authorities*, to *Ecclisastical and Profane*; for proving the Doctrines of the Trinity, and the Divinity and Incarnation of our Saviour.

He quotes the Account which *Pliny* gives to the Emperor *Trajan*, concerning the Christians; that they were wont to meet *before Day*, *Et Cæcilius Christo caute ut Deo, To flag. Psalms to Christ as if he were a God.*

He cites also a Dialogue, supposed to be *Lucian's*, in which that Author jeers the God who is *Three and One*. These two Authors were very Ancient, within about 100 Years after Christ; and their words (before quoted) show, How *early* the belief of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of our Saviour was found among Christians.

For *Ecclisastical Writers*, he brings some Fragments out of *Jasius*, *Irenæus*, *Clement Alexandrinus*, *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, *Cyprian*, *Lactantius*, *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, *Pelagius*; also out of the Councils of *Nice*, *Antioch*, and *Constantinople*.

He saith; the Socinians are apt to appeal in these Questions, to the *Anti-Nicene* Fathers before-named; and that several great Men, such as *Erasmus*, *Oronius*, *Petavius*, and others, yield this Point to Us.

I will make no Advantage of our Author's Ignorance in this Matter; I will freely own to you, Sir, that the Socinians never appeal (in these Questions) to the Fathers, whether *Anti-Nicene*, or others, who are now extant. We grant, they were in *Seminions* very different from ours, all the *Anti-Nicene*

Fathers, I mean, *whose works have been suffered to come down to our Times*, were in the Opinion (concerning God and the Lord Christ) afterwards called *Arianism*; except (perhaps) *Cladius Alexandrianus*, who seems to have held the same with *Socinus*.

Nor do *Erasmus*, *Petavius*, *Gratius*, and other Criticks grant to us, as he supposes, that the *Anti-Nicæ* Fathers were of our Opinion; they have granted those Fathers, not to us, but to the *Arians*. They grant, those Fathers did not hold the Doctrine of the Trinity, or of the Divinity of our Saviour, in such manner as *is now held by the Church*; for the Church holds a Trinity of Three *Coequal* and *Coeternal* Persons, all of them jointly and equally *Creators*, none of them *Creatures*; but those Fathers held a Trinity, in which only the First Person is truly God, or the most high God; the Second and Third are *Creatures*, though also they were the *Creators* (according to these Fathers) of the other *Creatures*. They say indeed sometimes, that the Son is *Coeternal*, and a Creator; but by *Coeternal* they mean only, that he was not made in *Time*, but in that *Eternity* which did precede *Time*, and the Creation of the World. They call that Duration, *Time*, which began with the World, and which is both Made and Measured by the Motion of the Sun, and other Heavenly Bodies; and that Duration is by them called *Eternity*, which preceded those Bodies, and the Motions which make *Time*. Therefore when they call the Son, *Coeternal*; which (I think) is not found in all their Writings above once or twice; they do not mean, that He was *Really* and *Actually* Coexists with the Father from all *Eternity*: But 'tis their Intention to say, He was made by the Father in that Duration which Philosophy calls *Eternity*, some space before the World was made, that He might be the Father's *Instrument* and *Minister* in creating all things. Hereby they acknowledge, that the Son was in some sense a *Creator*, and God; but it was only as He was the Father's *Minister*, *Instrument*, and *Servant*

(those are the Terms they use) in making all things: He was a *Creator* and God, with respect to all other *Creatures*, but with respect (say they) to the true and most high God, He is only a *Servant* and a *Creature*.

In a word, the *Anti-Nicæ* Fathers (i. e. those of the first 325 Years) *whose Works have been suffered to be extant*, neither held as the Unitarians do, that the Lord Christ began to have a Being, when He was born of the Virgin; nor as the Church now does, that He was true God, and always *actually* Coexists with God: but they held with the *Arians*, that He was *Created*, *Begotten*, or *Made*, (for these are, with them, equivalent Terms) in that Tract or Duration which is called, not *Time*, but *Eternity*; and that He was the Father's *Servant* and *Instrument*, in making first the Holy Ghost, then the rest of the Creation.

This is that which is granted by *Petavius*, *Huetius*, *Mornay*, *Erasmus*, *Gratius*, and other Criticks on the Fathers; not (as our Author supposes) that those Fathers held the Doctrine concerning God, and our Lord Christ, that is now called *Socinianism*.

But though this be so, yet we doubt not that we are able to prove, that the general Body of Christians, and an innumerable majority of their Learned Men, believed as the Unitarians now do, till about the Times of *Victor* and *Epiphanius*, Bishops of *Rome*; that is, till toward the Year of our Lord 180.

It has not availed our Opposers, that they have suppressed the Works of those most Ancient Fathers, who are known and confessed to have been Unitarians, such as *Aquila*, *Symeonides*, and *Theodoret*, who so excellently translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek; and *Lucianus*, who restored the Greek Copies to their first integrity: *Artemas* and *Theodorus*, Men (noted by their Adversaries to have been) incomparably Learned, and antecedent than any of the *Orthodox* Fathers, as we now call them. *Paul*

also Patriarch of Antioch, Photinus Archbishop of *Sirmium*, Marcellus Bishop of *Ancyra*: I say, it has not advantaged our Opposers, that they have destroyed the Writings of these Fathers; for the Fathers that are still extant, give us an account of the *Opinion* of those other Fathers, who *contesting their Arguments*. Moreover, they confess, that those first Unitarians claimed to be the true *Successors and Descendants of the Apostles*, and that they derived their *Doctrines from them*. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 28.

Besides this, the only Creed of all the Churches till the Council of *Nice*, and which is called the *Apostles Creed* (because it contains the true *Apostolic Tradition*) is consent on all hands to be wholly *Unitarian*. That Creed acknowledges but one God, the Father Almighty; and but one only Son of God; even him (saith this Creed) who was conceived, generated or begotten by the Holy Ghost on the Virgin *Mary*; nor (as our Opposers feign) an Eternal Son, begotten of the Essence of God his Father. But I will not, Sir, now dilate on these things, it shall be done in a Treatise by itself, if it please God to give me *Leisure and Opportunity*: in the mean time I appeal to those Learned Critics, *Petavius* and others before mentioned, that the ordinary presence of such Scriblers and Schismatics as our Author, is utterly false and ungrounded; even this, that the Antiochian Fathers held the Doctrine of the Trinity, *as the Church now does*.

As for the Scoffs of *Lusius* on the God who is *Thru and One, One and Thru*, nor having the Book by me, I cannot tell, whether he meant to jeer the Trinity of the *Platonick Philosophers*, or of the *Christians*; I conjecture he means the former.

Neither was he so ancient as some give

out; the best Critics make him to have flourished about the Year of our Lord 176, when the *new Doctrines* were grown very rise and common.

The Account that *Pliny* gives of the Christians to the Emperor *Trajan*, is ancient; but (in the particular objected to us) very *uncertain*. The Copies of *Pliny* in *Tertullian's* Time, express the matter thus, *Ad commendam Christo & Deo, They sang Psalms of Praise to Christ and to God; not (as Deu) to Christ as God*. The very words of *Tertullian* are these; " *Pliny* in his Letter " to *Trajan*, objects nothing else to them, " but that they were obstinate in refusing " to sacrifice; and that they held (as *Deu*) " *ante lucas, in commendam Christo & Deo*) " Meetings before day, to sing to Christ " and to God. *Tertul. Apol. adu. Gentes*, c. 9. I make use of an Edition of *Tertullian*, with the Notes of all the Critics, published by *Rigaltius at Paris*; yet none of them dislikes the Reading by *Tertullian*, or prefers to it the *modern Reading*.

But admitting now, that we were to read *as Deu*, as to a God: *Pliny* in these words might speak only his own Opinion, not the Opinion of the Christians: He might conjecture, that because the Christians sang certain *Compositions* in Praise of the Lord Christ in their Meetings, therefore they held him to be a God. Or, *as Deu*, may be translated, *as if he were a God*; so as to make this sense: " They sing Psalms and Hymns to " Christ, as if he were a God, whom them- " selves confess to have been a Man; for " Hymns are not usually sung but only to " the Gods. However it be, this Citation makes not much to the purpose; at most, it only proves, that even in *Pliny's* Time, some began to corrupt the Evangelical Doctrine concerning the Unity of God.

CH P A. X.

On divers Passages out of the Evangelists and Epistles.

FROM the Fathers, our Author returns again to the Scriptures, and advances an Argument to prove our Saviour's Divinity from those Texts which seem to intimate, that the Lord Christ is to be *prayed unto*; and also from others, in which 'tis said, that even while he was upon Earth, he was *worshipped* by some, and did not refuse the *worship* paid to him.

He saith, no Person can be the proper Object of Divine Worship, such as *Prayer* is; but He who is Omniscient, Omnipotent, and Omnipresent; and that if the Socinians ascribe these Properties to our Saviour, they make him to be *true God*.

That Jesus Christ was *worshipped*, and that he ought to be worshipped, he proves from these Texts; Phil. 2. 9, 10, 11. *God hath highly exalted him, and given to him a Name above every Name: That at the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, of things in Heaven, and things on Earth, and things under the Earth; And that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.* Mat. 28. 16, 17. *The eleven Disciples went away into Galilee, into a Mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped him. With others the like.*

Then for *praying* to him, there are these Texts: Mat. 8. 25. *Lord, save us, or we perish.* Luke 17. 5. *Lord, increase our Faith.* Acts 7. 59. *Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit.* 2 Cor. 12. 8, 9. *I beseege the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me: but he said to me, My Grace is sufficient for thee. — Therefore I will rather glory in my Infirmitas, that the Power of Christ may rest upon me.* 1 Thess. 3. 11, 12. *God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way to you.* 1 Cor. 1. 2. *To all that (in every place) call upon the Name of the Lord Jesus,*

To which last there are several other Texts which are *Parallels*.

Of the Invocation of Christ.

That we are to *pray* not only to God, but also to the Lord Christ, is held by very many of the Unitarians themselves; from the time that *G. Blandrata* and *F. Socinus* carried this Point against their Opposers in the Conferences and Synods of Poland.

Socinus and his Party urged, as *Mr. Milb.* here does, that the Apostle saith, *To all who in every place call on the Name of the Lord Christ.* It was answered, that the words of this, and other the like Texts, should have been rendered, *To all who in every place are called by the Name of the Lord Christ; i. e. who from Christ are called Christians.* It was said further, that admitting the Vulgar Translation, yet to *call on the Name of Christ*, imports no more but this, even to *call on his Name in Prayer*; that is, to go to God in the Name of Christ, calling on his Name, as that only Name by which we can be heard.

Socinus alledged the words of the same Apostle, *God himself, even our Father, and the Lord Christ, direct our way to you.* It was answered, that this, and what follows, is not a formal *Prayer*; but the Apostle *desires* and *wishes* that his Journey to *Thessalonica* may be directed and prospered by God, as the Fountain of all good and favourable Providences, and by the Lord Christ as the Mediator who continually intercedes for all necessary Benefits for the Faithful, both Temporal Benefits and Spiritual. 'Tis in the same manner that we are to interpret the next words, *The Lord make you to abound and increase*

increase in Love: for the Efficiency of the Lord Christ (if he be the Person here meant) in conferring Grace of any kind, is only, *by his Mediation*, the general Mediation he makes for all the Faithful.

Socius went on; The Apostle saith concerning the Thorn (or Temptation) in his Flesh, that he *bisought the Lord* *thrice* concerning it: who answered, *My Grace is sufficient for thee*: from whence the Apostle concludes, that he *will glory in his Infirmities*, that the *Power of Christ may rest on him*. But it was said, the Lord to whom the Apostle prayed, is the Lord God, not the Lord Christ; and by those words, *I will glory in my Infirmities*, that the *Power of Christ may rest on me*; He means, he will even boast and rejoice in his Infirmities, seeing they are the occasion of manifesting the Power of Christ; namely, the Virtue and Power of Christ's Mediation with God, the Effects of which do rest on him, and on all the Faithful.

Socius alleged St. Stephen's dying words, *Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit*. They replied, every one may see in the Original, that it should have been translated, *O Lord of Jesus*, (i. e. O God) *receive my Spirit*.

There was good reason why St. Stephen should use this Form, *O Lord of Jesus*, rather than barely *O my God*, or any such like: for being tried and condemned for his Faith in Christ Jesus, it was proper to make mention of him, and to bear Testimony to him with his very last and dying words. It were enough for another to say, *O Lord God*, receive my Spirit: But a Martyr for Christ, and the first Martyr very properly said, *O thou Lord of Jesus*, for whose Name and Profession I suffer, receive my Spirit.

I know not whether *Socius* urged the words of the Apostles to our Saviour, *Lord, increase our Faith*; and again, *Lord, save us, or we perish*: I judge he was more judicious than to trifle after such a manner. For when they say, *Increase our Faith*, and *save us* from sinking in this Storm: they undoubtedly meant, that he should increase

their Faith, *by his Prayers to God for them*; and that he should *save them* from sinking, by that miraculous Power which Prophets have over the Works of Nature: as when *Elisha* made Iron to swim; when he blinded the Host of the Syrians; when *Moses* divided the Red Sea, and *Jesus* broke down the Walls of *Jericho*. That this is a true Interpretation, we learn from the words of the Apostles, when the Storm ceased, and the Danger was over; *What manner of MAN, say they, is this, that even the Winds and Sea obey him?* They cried not out, as Mr. Milburn and his Fellow Licensors do, *The Gods are come down to us in the likeness of Men*: but as sober Men bred up in the knowledge of the Scriptures, and to the acknowledgment of one only God; *What manner of MAN is this?* How great a Prophet, whom both the Sea and Winds obey?

The first Unitarians, who contended that we ought to pray only to God, thought that they very much confirmed the before-mentioned Answers, by urging first, that our Saviour being consulted about the *Object* and the *Manner* of Prayers, answered; When ye pray, say, *Our Father which art in Heaven*. As who should say, God is the only Object of Prayer, you can address to no other but to Him: but go to him as to your Father, with the ingenuous Assurance of Children, not the Dread and Awe of meer Creatures and Vassals. Secondly, Speaking also of the time of his Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven, he saith, *John 16. 23. In that day ye shall ask me nothing: ———— Whatever ye shall ask the Father in my Name (calling on my Name) he will give it you.* Elsewhere he saith, *I will give it you*; meaning, by his Intercession with God. 'Tis plainly as much as to say; Hitherto you have asked many things of me, because I am present with you to intercede for you; but the time is coming, when ye can ask me nothing, because I shall be taken from you; but be comforted, and ask immediately of the Father, calling on my Name, he will give you whatsoever

you shall ask, if it be good for you. Thirdly : To make Christ himself the Object to which we pray, is to destroy his *Mediatory Office* : For if he hears our Prayers, and both *can* and *doth* (by a Power constantly vested in him, as *Socinus* supposes) relieve our Wants ; to what purpose is he appointed to be our Advocate and Intercessor with God ?

How unlike, and utterly inconsistent, are these two Sayings ; this of *Socinus*, We may and ought to pray to the Lord Christ as He who can himself help us ; and this (contrary) saying of the Apostle, *He* (Christ) *is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him*, (i. e. that pray to God, calling on his Name, or for his sake) *seeing He ever liveth to make Intercession for them*. What can be more evident, than that here Christ's saving us from the Evils, which we either fear or labour under, is ascribed not to his own Inherent Power, but to the Power of his Intercession or Mediation with God ? Which Mediation is not to be understood of a *Verbal* or *Personal* Mediation, proceeding from a particular knowledge of our Wants or Prayers ; but of a general Mediation for All, by his *Merits*, that is, by the perfect Obedience, and most acceptable Services that he has performed to God.

The truth is, *Socinus*, and the Socinians properly so called, do not own the *Mediatory Office of Christ* : But they make him to be a Mediator, not that He intercedes for us, but because He is *Medius inter Deum & Homines*, between God and Man ; being vested with a Power from God, to bestow on the Faithful, all necessary and convenient Things ; in a word, He is not an *Intercessor* for Us, but a *King* to protect and help us.

Thus *Polakius* (as he has been published, perhaps corrected, by *Crellius*) saith, *Estimo* *Prout*, &c. i. v. " Although Christ did now pray for us, which yet we do not grant, it will not follow that He himself may not be prayed unto ; for nothing hinders, but that he who prays to another, may

also be prayed to. *De vera Relig. Lib. 5. c. 30. p. 578.*

For my own part, I do not affirm any thing upon this Question ; but I have mentioned these Arguments and Replies, that it may appear, that if our present Opposer (*Mr. Noll.*) does indeed say true, that *Prayer must needs be to God, who may be prayed unto* ; yet it will not follow, therefore the Lord Christ is God ; because it cannot be demonstratively proved, that there is any real Scripture-ground for praying unto him.

But he will still urge, that at least those Unitarians who contend for the Invocation of the Lord Christ, are within danger and reach of his Objection ; even this, that they must ascribe to Christ an Omniscience, Omnipotence, and Omnipresence ; which are the very Attributes, the *essential* Attributes of the One true God.

I do not think this is a necessary Consequence ; they do not make another God by their praying to the Lord Christ : It doth not follow, that He is Omnipresent, Omniscient and Omnipotent, because 'tis supposed and held, that He may be prayed unto, and also can supply all our Wants.

First, For Omniscience. 'Tis the General Opinion of all Sects and Parties of Christians, that the glorified Saints have more than a *Prophetic Knowledge*, by that which the Schools have called the *Beatific Vision* ; or, as the Apostle speaks, by *seeing God as he is*. The Benefit of the *Beatific Vision*, shall be to Persons, in proportion to their Labour of Duty and Love, which they have showed to the Service of God : Therefore our Lord Christ in his present Glorified State, may have such a perfect sight of God, as to see in him, the Desires and Prayers, the Difficulties, Defects and Perfections of such as call upon God in his Name. The Fathers and Schools do suppose, that the Saints in Heaven know very many things, both past and to come, by the *Beatific Vision* ; and that the Conversation in Heaven is not by *Speech* or Words, but by *Intuition* or Vision, or some the like way : 'Tis not therefore irrational,

rational, or bordering on *Idolatry*, or on *Polytheism*; if we suppose, that by the same Beatifick Vision, our Prayers are known to the Lord Christ, especially considering, that He is the *Appointed* Mediator for us.

Next for Omnipotence and Omnipresence; the Lord Christ may be able to succour us in Wants, both Temporal and Spiritual, without our supposing either that He is Omnipresent or Omnipotent: For the Omnipotence of God can confer even on things *Insensible* a miraculous Power; nay such a Power as can effect Miracles at the greatest distance. Thus the Bones of the Prophet had Power to restore a dead Man so Life; The Brazen Serpent healed such as did but look toward it from a *distant* Place. But if such Virtue as this could be given to *inanimate* Things; the Divine Wisdom may have Reasons, and the Divine Omnipotence has an Ability to enable the Lord Christ to do Miracles, *as far as from Heaven to Earth*; and such Miracles too, as reach the *Minds* as well as the *Bodies* of Men.

We know not the Philosophy, or the Manner of the thing: but as 'tis (undeniable) not impossible; so 'tis an Hypothesis more rational, and infinitely more safe and pious, than to multiply Gods; or what is the same thing, (only in other words) *Divine Persons*, as our Trinitarian Opposers do.

I shall only add farther, upon this Subject of the Invocation of Christ; that whereas 'tis a Question, that has very much divided the Unitarians, *Whether the Lord Christ may be prayed unto?* There is no cause why they should not bear with one another, notwithstanding their dissent about this Question. For we have seen, that He may be the Object of Prayer, without making him God, or a Person of God; and without ascribing to him the Properties of the Divine Nature, Omnipresence, Omniscience and Omnipotence. Nor (on the other hand) do such as refuse to pray to any but God, dishonour the Lord Christ; even tho it be supposed that He may be prayed to;

because in refusing to pray to him, they only refuse what they suppose that He himself hath forbidden; which maketh their Error, if it be an Error, to be *pure and mere Error*, not Malice, not Neglect or Contempt, which are the only things that are punishable by a just Judge, whether such Judge be God or a Man. Which one thing, were it but considered (as, I think, 'tis *confess'd*.) by such as are Legislators, or Judges; the Account they must give as last to God, would be much more comfortable and tolerable for them, than now it is like to be.

Of the Adoration, or Worship of Christ.

That our Lord Christ is to be worshipp'd, was never made a Question by the Unitarians; we doubt not, that the Angels of Heaven do worship him: the Question is concerning the *kind* or *sort* of Worship. Trinitarians say, He is to be worshipp'd as God: we say, He is to be worshipp'd, as one (that I may use the Apostle's words) *whom God hath exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour*; or as another Apostle speaks, as one *whom God hath given to be Head over all things to the Church*, Acts 5. 31. Ephes. 1. 22.

There are three sorts of Worship; the first is *Civil Honour or Worship*; which is given to Others on account of Civil Dignity, or Natural Endowments, or the worthiness of the Rational Nature common to *all*. This kind of Worship is due more especially from Inferiors to Superiors; but is not to be neglected by Superiors to Inferiors. Next there is *Religious Worship*, which we give to others on account of their Holiness, or of their Relation to God: And 'tis more or less, as their Sanctity or their Relation to God is greater or less; this sort of Worship is due to holy Men and Women, to the Ministers of God and holy Things, more yet to Prophets, above them to glorified Spirits and Angels. We see in the Bible, that *Religious Worship* was express'd by Terms of great deference

sence and respect; such as *My Father*, and *My Lord*; and for outward Acts, sometimes by Kneeling, sometimes by Prostration, sometimes other ways; as on the other hand, they were sometimes accepted, sometimes refused. *Lastly*, There is *Divine Worship*, which belongs only to God. It consists in a Resignation of our Understandings to what God shall say or reveal; a Resignation of our Wills and Desires to what he does or decrees; 'tis a giving up our Affections to love him more than all things besides: It consists moreover in such external Acts and Significations of Reverence and of Love towards him, as we reserve only for him, and never give to any other.

I say now, the Texts cited and urged by our Opposer, do not prove, that the Lord Christ ought to be worshipp'd with more than a *Civil* and *Religious* Worship: there are no Acts of Worship ever required to be paid to him, but such as may be paid to a *Civil* Power, to a Person in high Dignity and Office, or to Prophets and holy Men,

or to such as are actually possessors of the Heavenly Beatitudes. What if it is said the Apostles *worshipp'd* (that is, kneeled to) him, *Mat.* 28. 17. and that to him every Knee both in Heaven and Earth *shall bow*? *Phil.* 2. 11. Let our Opposers show that the Apostles worshipp'd him, not as their *Master*, but as their *God*; or that every Knee is to bow to him, not as to a Superior Lord, but as to a Person who is true and most High God: till they prove this, they prove nothing to the present purpose. We are well assured that we can prove the contrary; because we can prove the Lord Christ was a *Man*, a Person who for his holy Life and Death was *exalted by God*, which is inconsistent with his being God, or a Person of God; and whatsoever *Name* he hath, that Name was *given to him* by God; and whatsoever *Worship* is paid to him, is paid to him *for the Sake, by the Command, and to the Glory* (that I may use *St. Paul's* words) *of God, the Father of all*; *Phil.* 2. 11.

C H A P. XI.

Of the Satisfaction.

AFTER having proved, as he thinks, the Divinity of our Saviour, our Author undertakes to prove too the vulgar Doctrine of the *Satisfaction*. He saith, *P.* 683, 684. The Infinite Justice of God necessarily requires, that every *Sinner*, nay, that every *Transgression* be punish'd. Therefore, saith he farther, that Mankind is pardoned, is an *Effect* of the *Justice of God*; to which Justice a full Satisfaction being paid, by the *Sufferings* of the Lord Christ in our stead; God could not evidence his Justice otherways than by granting Pardon and Salvation to us. If God could pardon us

freely, without a Satisfaction to his Justice, why are not the fallen Angels pardoned?

At *P.* 706. he has contrived a Tale, or Romance, concerning a certain King, who taking Pity of his Rebels, declared that they should be pardoned, if any Person would be so kind to them, as to suffer in their stead: He tells us, the King's only Son offered to suffer for them; and his Offer being accepted by his Father, who *dearly loved him*, the Son died, and the Rebels were saved. And this, he saith, is exactly our case with God.

He pretends also to answer to some Objections made by the Socinians, against the (pretended) *Satisfaction to God's Justice by the Lord Christ for our Sins*. They object, that the Doctrine of a full Satisfaction to God's Justice on our behalf, destroys the free Grace of God (so much magnified in holy Scripture) in the gratuitous Pardon of our Sins: for if God received an *Equivalent* on our behalf, he hath not pardoned us, but only discharged or acquitted us, because our Debt to his Justice has been paid for us by another. To this he answers, Yes, the Grace and Pardon of God to us was most free: because tho' our Debt to God's Justice has been paid, yet not by us, but by a Person whom God himself found out for us. Besides, the Satisfaction made for us by the Sufferings of the Lord Christ, being a *refusable Payment*, because God might have required the Satisfaction of our selves, or from us; therefore he is rightly said to have pardoned us, and to have shown most free Grace and Favour to us, even tho' an *Equivalent*, and Satisfaction was made to his Justice on our behalf.

Again; They object, that God could not in Justice substitute a most *worthy* and *righteous* Person to undergo Punishment, properly so called, in the place and stead of *unrighteous* and *worthless* Persons; that were to pervert the Nature and whole Design of that sort of Justice which is exercised about Rewards and Punishments. He answers, God might punish the Lord Christ for us; First, Because under the Law the *innocent* Beast was substituted to Death and Punishment, by being made a Sacrifice for the Sin, and instead of the offending Owner and Master: then, because the Lord Christ freely offered himself to suffer in our room and stead.

Further, they object, that the *three days Death* of the Lord Christ cannot be *equivalent*, and therefore not a Satisfaction to the Justice of God for the *eternal Death* and *Damnation* of one Sinner, much less of all Mankind. For, supposing that the Value of Sufferings or Punishment is increased

even to Infinity, by the infinite Dignity of the Person that suffers; and supposing again, that the Lord Christ being God as well as Man, was indeed a Person of Infinite Dignity; yet seeing his Divinity could suffer nothing at all, but only his Humanity; therefore his Sufferings were but *human and finite*, and consequently no way commensurate to the infinite Punishment due to one Sinner, much less to that of all Sinners. He replies, First, that to the account of the Sufferings or Punishment of the Lord Christ, we must reckon all the Sufferings of his Life, and especially his Agony in the Garden; which (our Author saith) was so great, that it was equivalent to that eternal Punishment prepared by God for all impenitent Sinners, p. 749.

But lest the Agony in the Garden and on the Cross, should seem to any, to have been too much short in time, to be laid in the Balance against the eternal Damnation of all Mankind: Therefore he subjoins, 2. As our Sins are made infinite, by their being committed against the Infinite Majesty of God: So the Satisfaction of the Lord Christ for us by his Death and other Punishments was also infinite, on the account of God's Greatness to which that Satisfaction was made, p. 662. That is, the Punishment of the Lord Christ was infinite, because he offered it to an Infinite God. He adds in the same place, God would never have accepted the Sufferings of the Lord Christ instead of ours, if he had not certainly known, that they were equivalent to the Punishments due to us for Sin. 3. The Person that suffered for us was both God and Man, and thereby his Sufferings were of an infinite Value, and so equivalent to the Infinite Punishment due to us: for tho' the true God could neither die nor suffer; yet he who was true God did both suffer and die, p. 663.

And because he understands not the true state of the Question and Difference between the Unitarians and the Church, concerning the Satisfaction by our Saviour; he hath objected to us a great number of

Texts, which are no way contrary to our Doctrine. He tells us from holy Scripture, that the Lord Christ was wounded for our Transgressions, was bruised for our Iniquities; that we are healed by his Stripes; that God hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all; that he made his Soul an Offering for Sin; that he was delivered for our Offences; that he bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree, or Cross. To these he adds, Rom. 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation for our Sins; — to declare his (God's) Righteousness, that he may be just, and the Justifier of him that believeth on Jesus.*

This, Sir, is the Sum and Force of what our Author hath discoursed at large concerning the Satisfaction. He is so well assured of the Truth of his Doctrine, that he ends his Book with twice imprecating on himself a Curse, if he shall ever write or teach other ways than he has taught his Reader in this present Book.

I will take a short view of all that he hath said.

He saith, first; The Infinite Justice of God requires, that every Sinner, nay, that every Transgression be punished; and that when God pardons and saves Sinners, this is *an Act of his Justice*; to which Justice a full Satisfaction having been paid by the Lord Christ, God cannot be just other ways than by pardoning and saving us. And if God can pardon without a Satisfaction to his Justice, why are not the Devils forgiven?

This was argued like a *Boxer* in these Questions: the more Learned of his own Party know that the Cause is lost, if in the Question of the Satisfaction, Almighty God be not considered as a *Governor*, who indeed can forgive the Offenders, but for *Prudential* Reasons he *will not* forgive without a Satisfaction to his Honour and Justice.

Our Author stands in it, that God cannot forgive any Offender, or Offence, without Satisfaction by the Offender himself, or another in his stead. Why, what is the reason

that the King and Proprietor of the whole World cannot forgive? He answers, *'Tis contrary to his Justice*. But is it contrary to Justice to show Mercy, or to remit of my own Rights and Dues? Am I unjust if I do not exact the *whole* of what is due to me? I may certainly do what I will with my own, else 'tis not *truly* and *wholly* my own. He that cannot forgive, neither can he give; for Forgiveness is nothing else, but giving my Right (to Debt or Punishment) to the Person who is indebted, or has offended me. 'Tis contrary (he saith) to the Justice of God, to forgive either the Transgression, or the Transgressor: but if it be contrary to Justice, 'tis *essentially* and *morally* evil: I ask therefore, How can God command us to forgive to one another our Transgressions and Offences? Can God command us what is morally and essentially evil, or what is contrary to the eternal Laws of Justice, by which he himself is obliged? O marvellous Scheme of Justice! 'tis contrary (they say) to Justice, to pardon without a full Satisfaction; but not contrary to Justice to lay my Guilt, and the Punishment due to it, on a Person *wholly* innocent and *probably* righteous: 'tis unjust to *forget* the *real* Offender, or to *abate* of the Punishment due to him; but not unjust to substitute a *well-deserving* Person to the Punishment that belonged to the other. — In a word, to *show Mercy* by pardoning Offences is Unjustice; but to *mistake Punishment* is none at all, but worthy of the Holiness and of the Wisdom of God.

But he saith, if God can forgive without an Equivalent, or Satisfaction to his Justice by the Offender, or another for him, why are not the Devils forgiven? And I ask, seeing an infinite Satisfaction hath been made in the Opinion of our Author and his Party, for Sinners, why are not the Devils comprehended in it? The same Infinite Satisfaction which our Opposers teach, was abundantly enough for the Fallen Angels as well as for Men: let them tell us, how so much precious *Merit* comes to be lost? This

Question

Question can never be answered on the Hypothesis of our Opposers; but on the Unitarian Hypothesis there is no difficulty at all in the case of the fallen Angels; for we answer, they are not forgiven, *because they repent not, nor amend.* Almighty God, as King and Proprietor of all Persons and Things, can forgive any Offence, or all Offences, even without Repentance or Amendment; nor is it contrary to his Justice so to do: but 'tis inconsistent with his Wisdom, because to forgive without Repentance or Amendment, is to encourage Sin and Disorder in the World: 'Tis also contrary to the Holiness of God, that the Incurrible and Impenitent should escape unpunish'd. Our Opposers mistake too in thinking that 'tis the Justice of God by which he is prompted to punish Sinners; 'tis his Holiness and Wisdom: Justice has no other share or interest in Punishment, but only to see that Punishment be *not misplaced*, and that it do *not exceed the Offence*.

As to his Tale about the (mad) old King, and his (foolish) Son, 'tis perfectly ridiculous. He hath imagined, a King that promises to pardon his Rebels, if any other will be so kind as to suffer for them. 'Tis a mad Proposition, in the highest degree unreasonable and unjust; because if it was necessary that their Offences should be punish'd; Justice and Reason require, that the Offenders themselves, and not an innocent Person or Persons should suffer. Well, but as mad as the old King was, his Son was as foolish; for (our Author assures us) the Son offered to save the Rebels by dying in their stead: nor did the Folly of the Father and the Son stop here; for when the Father heard his Son say that he would die for the Rebels, he approved his Son's Extravagance, put his Son to Death, and pardoned his Rebels. Now does our Author forbear to publish his own proper Folly, by telling us, that the old King *dearly loved his Son*, tho he put him to Death for other Men's Faults: He adds, that *this is our very case*, with respect to God Almighty and the Lord

Christ: 'Tis so, I acknowledg, in the Hypothesis of our Opposers; but let them see to it; whether they do not expose themselves to just Scorn; while they can no ways defend their Hypothesis of the Satisfaction, but by comparing Almighty God and our Lord Christ to two such Prodiges of Folly, as never really were (or could be) in Nature, but only in the Fiction and Fancy of the Poetaster of Yarmouth.

I demand, would our Poet himself, as odd-conceited as he is, put his Son to death, or consent that he should be put to Death, to save his Maligents and Adversaries from a Punishment highly due to their Crimes? He hath been a great Enemy in his time to Rebellion, and at this day is writing Books against Rebels who are dead forty Years ago: Would he give one of his Children to Death, to save any of the surviving Rebels, as suppose Friend Ludlow? If he is neither so silly, nor so wicked to his Child, how has he dared to say, this is our case with respect to Almighty God and the Lord Christ? Why did not the Comparison and Instance that he himself devised, open his Eyes to discern the Folly and Inconsistency of his Doctrine?

The Socinians object to their Opposers in these Questions, That if *an Equivalent* (which Trinitarians call a *Satisfaction*) has been given to God's Justice, on our behalf, by the Sufferings of the Lord Christ, then God hath not truly pardoned us, which the Scriptures every where affirm, but only *discharged*, and *acquitted* us, because (our Debt being paid): he could do no less.

Our Author answers; Tho God's Justice has been satisfied, yet it was God who found out the Person, who was able and willing to pay our Debt: Besides, the Sufferings of our Lord Christ, tho they were *equivalent* to the Punishment due to Sinners, were a *refusable Payment*; for God might have required, that the Sinners should suffer in their own Persons, not in the Person of a Redeemer, Mediator or Undertaker.

I will be so liberal, as to grant to our Author both these Answers; but I must insist upon it, that they are no Answers to the Objection proposed. For God doth not pardon his Debt or Offence, because he finds out a third Person that will pay or suffer for the Debtor or Offender; these two differ just as much as Payment and Forgiveness; that is to say, they are Contraries. But our Author adds, the Sufferings of the Lord Christ were a *refusable Payment*: 'tis well, but he saith, they were an *equivalent Payment*; how then can God be said to pardon us? doth He forgive who receives an *Equivalent* to the Debt due to him? Yes, he saith, it is Forgiveness *with respect to us*, for we have paid nothing, whatever our Friend, whom God found out, hath paid for us. But why doth he not consider that the Scriptures not only say, that *Sinners are pardoned*, but they say, *God hath pardoned them*? You may call their *Discharge* a *Pardon*, with respect to them; but you can never say, *God hath pardoned them*, if they are only *discharged* upon an *Equivalent* given for them, or paid by another on their behalf. To say, God hath pardoned us, supposes that he has received no *Equivalent* on our behalf; for if he had, however *we might be said to be pardoned*, yet it could not be said that *God pardoned us*; for the Pardon must (in that case) be imputed to the Person or Persons, who made the Satisfaction or the *Equivalent*, not to God. To avoid this, our Opposers say, he that made the Satisfaction, was God: the Son of God, who is also himself true God, that very true God to whom the Satisfaction was made, he made for us the Satisfaction. But this is *far gone*, and we expected Reason from them: The one true God, they say, made for us the Satisfaction to the one true God; we deny that 'tis *Sense*, or *intelligible*. There is but one true God, and he is to receive the Satisfaction for our Sins against his Infinite Majesty, and not to give Satisfaction: How then can they say, but that they are accustomed to say any thing, the one true

God made for us the Satisfaction? And if it could be true what they say, that God himself paid for us the *Equivalent* or Satisfaction; this is indeed no other but *forgiving us without a Satisfaction*, which is the very thing they deny: For if I pay to my self the Debt of my Debtor, or undergo the Punishment of my Offender; this is but a *mock-Satisfaction*, and I indeed *forgive him without a Satisfaction*. Which is so plain, that I wonder that so many Learned Persons as have written on the one and the other side of this Question, have not observed it.

Another Objection of the Socinians against the (pretended) Satisfaction, is; God could not (justly or wisely) substitute an innocent and well-deserving Person, to undergo Punishment, properly so called, in the place and stead of the Unrighteous and Worthless; because 'tis of the Nature of Justice, not to misplace Punishment. Our Author's Answers are; The *Innocent Beast* was sacrificed for the Sin of the Owner; and the Lord Christ *freely offer'd himself*, to suffer for us, though we were Worthless and Wicked.

His instance of Beasts offer'd in Sacrifice, on occasion of the Sin of their Owners, is not a whit to the purpose; for the Owners having an *absolute* Dominion over, and a *complete* Right to the Service, Life, and very Life of their Beasts; therefore it was no Unjustice, when the Life of the Beast was given for the Offence of the Master or Owner. The Owner might kill his Beast for Food; therefore much more might he offer him to God, in lieu and exchange of his own Life, forfeited to God by Sin. And in this case, the *Worthless* was offer'd to the Mercy and gracious Acceptance of God, for the *Worthy*: so that there was no Offence committed, either against *Justice* or *Wisdom*. But all things are contrary, in the Lord Christ and Us, especially in the Hypothesis of our Opposers; for he was a Person, according to them, of *Infinite* Dignity and Merit; and we had no right in him, or *dominion* over

ver him, as the Sacrificer had over his Beast, that we should offer his Life or his Sufferings to God instead of our own.

As to that, the Lord Christ *freely offer'd himself* for Us, to undergo Punishment due to us; Neither could he do it, nor could God accept of it or allow it. An Innocent and Righteous Person may not, an Holy and Just Judge must not pervert the due Course of Justice. A just Governor may pardon Offenders, of his Mercy, but he cannot inflict their Punishment on the Innocent and Righteous; for 'tis of the very Essence of Justice, nay, is the first thing belonging to Justice, not to misplace Punishment. Not to misplace Punishment, and not to exceed the desert of the Offense, are the two things that constitute the Nature of *Punitive Justice*.

The last Objection, of which our Author thinks fit to take notice, is this; That the Three-days Death, and other Sufferings of the Lord Christ, could not be equivalent to the Eternal Damnation of so much as one Man, much less of all Mankind. He answers *three ways*.

1. Our Saviour's Agony in the Garden was, without doubt, such a weight of Sorrow and Pain, as was *equivalent* even to the eternal Damnation of *all Men*; else we must say, He was far less valiant in suffering, than many Martyrs have been; nay, was a very Dastard and Coward. Our Author pursues this Calumny upon his Saviour in several Pages; see, (Reader) from p. 739, to p. 749.

He makes *Calanus* the Indian (not a Christian neither, but an Heathen) a very Hero, in comparison of that poor dispirited pretender Jesus of Nazareth. He hath this Passage, at p. 739. "Nothing seems more *mean*, among the various Accounts of "Sufferers for Truth, than the Carriage "of our Saviour. He saith farther, That our Saviour prayed most earnestly to be delivered from Death; and that he sweat Drops, like Drops of Blood; but the Martyrs even offer'd themselves to the most

cruel Deaths; and *sang* in the midst of Torments.

It is true, that the great Passion of our Saviour in the Garden, has made many to think, not without cause, that it proceeded from some higher Reason, than the apprehension of the Death of the Cross, which He was shortly to undergo. It may be (very probably) supposed, that He conflicted *this* with great Temptations; that the Devil was very busy to fill his Mind with *horrid* Ideas and Representations; and that this was the Cause of his Agony, and that *an Angel* was sent to strengthen him. The Martyrs (on the contrary) had Influences and Assistances from the Divine Spirit; and the Tempter was withheld from venting his Malice on them.

But to suppose, with our present Author, that our Saviour underwent (in the Garden) the very Torments of Hell; nay, such Torments as are infinitely greater than Hell-Torments; because they were equivalent to the eternal Torments of *all* the Damned; this is said without any ground, nay, contrary to all good Reason. We must suppose, on our Author's Hypothesis, First, That Christ underwent in the space of an hour, such an acute Pain, as answers fully to the whole Pain of a Damned Person in all Eternity. Secondly, That this Pain was so multiplied, as to be equal to *all* the Tortures of *all* the Damned in *whole* Eternity; And yet, Thirdly, he was only *extending* *terrors*, and had a very great *Sweet*. Surely such a Pain would have made him to *cry out*, much more earnestly than on the Cross; and how could an Angel *strengthen him* under such a Pain, of which no Angel in Heaven could himself have bore the *thousandth* part?

But I would know too, why an Angel from Heaven should be sent to *strengthen him*, as is expressly said at *Luke 22.43*? Why not rather the Divine Person, which (our Opposers say) was in him, and with which he was personally united, and personally one? It had been far more natural, that *his*

his own Divinity should have *strengthened* his Humanity, than that the Angel shall be sent to support *that* Man, who was (they say) God-Man. I know not what Relishes other Mens Understandings may have, but it will never go down with me, that *God-Man* could want to be strengthened by an *Angel*; and I look upon this to be an unanswerable Argument, that our Lord Christ was only a Prophet, and not God, or any such super-eminent Spirit, as the Arians believe him to be.

But that our Saviour's Sufferings may not want *Weight*, to be laid in the Balance against *all* the Sufferings of *all* the Damned, our Author saith, 2. As the Guilt and Demerit of Sin is made Infinite, by being committed against the Infinite Majesty of God; so the Merit of Christ's Sufferings on our behalf becomes Infinite too, by being offered to an Infinite God.

I confess, when I read this, and his Story of the old King and his Son, I gave our Author over: for there never was any Man so silly but this Author, as to conceive, that a thing is made better or greater by the Greatness or Excellence of the Person to whom 'tis offered; tho' it be true that an Offence may be the greater, for some Qualifications of the Person against whom it is done.

If what he says were true, that the Infinity of God makes that Suffering which is presented to him to be also Infinite; what needed our Saviour to have undergone so much as our Author conceits; the Pain of the Cross; nay, the least Pain in his Finger had been sufficient, without the horrible Agony in the Garden, which he supposes to have been equal to *all* the

Pains of *all* the Damned, and that for ever. And if it be true, that Christ's Sufferings are made Infinite, by his Infinity to whom they are offered, then so also would the Sufferings of any other Man. This strange reasoning of our Author, makes the Punishment of Christ to be wholly needless; the Sinners themselves might have, *fully satisfied* God's Justice, and that too by the *slightest* Sufferings, if suffering receives its nature and degree from the Infinity of that Majesty to whom 'tis tendered.

He saith, thirdly, He that suffered for us was God and Man in one Person; and tho' ('tis true) *the true God could not die or suffer*; yet *He who was true God, did both suffer and die*. The Sufferings of such a Person must needs be esteemed of *Infinite Value*, tho' they were not Infinite in their *Intensity*, or in their *Duration*.

I think this to be almost as weak as the former Answer. For seeing they dare not pretend, that God could suffer any thing, but *only the Humanity*, which (They say) was united to him; such Sufferings were but *Human Sufferings*, the Sufferings of a Man, not of God, and therefore in no sense *Infinite*. Their Conceit, that the *Humanity* of Christ is united to the *Divine Person* of the Son, helps them not in this case; for God dwells in all the Faithful, nay, is united to them, and *one with them*; they are so joined (that I may use the Apostle's words) *to the Lord, as to be one Spirit with him*; 1 Cor. 6.17. John 17. 21. but neither their *Righteousness*, nor their *Sufferings* have any more value on that account, but are rated only according to their intrinsic, proper and real Worth.

C H A P. XII.

*On the Texts alledged for the Satisfaction; with a Conclusion
of the whole.*

THE last thing we are to consider, is the Collection of Texts that our Author has here made; he urges, First, That *He (Christ) was wounded for our Transgressions, was bruised for our Iniquities; that we are healed by his Stripes; that God hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all; that He hath made his Soul an Offering for Sin.* All this is taken out of the 53^d Chapter of *Isaiah*, which Chapter is by some taken to be a Prophecy, concerning the Prophet *Jeremiah*; by others, concerning the Messiah, or Christ. I do not think it to be any Prophecy at all, except in some few Passages of it; but especially not a Prophecy concerning a Person who was then to be born: I conceive the words are to be understood of the Prophet *Isaiah* himself, who speaking of himself, modestly speaks in the third Person, and the sense begins at *ver. 7.* of the foregoing Chapter.

I wonder very much, that so many Learned Men as have commented on this Prophet, have not discerned that the whole Discourse perfectly suits to the Prophet himself, and that he speaks of a Person *actually in being*, not of one who was yet to be born. But because it would take up a great deal of room to make a Paraphrase on the two Chapters, and to show the Reason of it; I will be content to set down the Explication by *Gratius* and *Socius*, of the particular Expressions here objected by our Author. *Gratius* is of opinion, that from *ver. 7.* of the foregoing Chapter, *Isaiah* prophesies of the Sufferings of the Prophet *Jeremiah*; yet so, that the whole Prophecy, and all the Expressions of the 53^d Chapter, had a second

Completion in the Person, Actions and Sufferings of the Lord Christ: and therefore some of the Expressions, tho originally intended of *Jeremiah*, are by the Writers of the New Testament accommodated also, and applied to the Lord Christ. Let us see what he saith.

Isa. 53. 5. He was wounded for our Transgressions, and was bruised for our Iniquities. But in the Original 'tis, he has been wounded by our Wickedness, and bruised by our Iniquity; that is, we have wickedly and unjustly afflicted and persecuted him.

The Chastisement of our Peace was upon him; and by his Stripes we are healed. No, the Original saith, *The Reproofs of our Peace were with him:* that is, the Reproofs that would have made our Peace with God, if we had hearkned to them, were truly with this Prophet; he reproved us justly, and for our saving Good, if we would have hearkned: and by those his Stripes we might have been healed, i. e. by those sharp and home-Reproofs, by those Stripes of his Mouth, we might have been amended and reformed, and thereby reconciled to God, and healed.

Ver. 6. All we, like Sheep, have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the Iniquity of us all. In the Hebrew, the Lord hath by him met with the Iniquity of us all: q. d. hath reformed all our Wickedness by him.

Ver. 10. When thou shalt make his Soul an Offering for Sin, he shall see his Seed, he shall prolong his days. But in the Hebrew thus; *If he (the Prophet) shall submit his Soul to Punishment, he shall see his Seed, and pro-*

long his days : cr, *Tho he submit his Soul to Punishment, &c.* Punishment, saith *Grotius* here, is properly for Sin; but the Hebrews (saith he) call all Affliction by or from others, tho unjust and undeserved, by the Name of Punishment.

But our Author objects again, that the Apostle saith, *Rom. 4. 25. He (Christ) was delivered for our Offences.* And *1 Pet. 2. 24. Who himself bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree, or Cross.* *Rom. 3. 24. Him hath God set forth to be a Propitiation for our Sins, to declare his (God's) Righteousness.* *Heb. 9. 26. Now once in the end of the World he hath appeared, to put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.*

Therefore 'tis to be noted, that very few of those that have undertaken to write against us, have really understood what we affirm or deny, concerning the *Cause*, or the *Effects* of our Saviour's Death. They trouble themselves with citing a great many Texts to evince that 'twas for our Sins (as one *Cause*) that Christ died; that he was a Sacrifice and Oblation for the Sins of the World; that he was a Ransom, a Price of Redemption for us. We deny none of these things, taken in a sober and possible sense : the Question is only this, Whether the Lord Christ offered himself as such a Sacrifice, Oblation or Price as might be made to the Justice of God, by way of Equivalent for what we should have suffered ; or was an Oblation and Application, as all former Sacrifices under the Law were, to the Mercy of God, by way of humble suit and deprecation ? We affirm the latter of these, that the Lord Christ, besides other Ends of his Death, rendered himself (in the nature of a Sacrifice) on the Altar of the Cross, to the Mercy and Benignity of God, by way of Supplication ; not to the Divine Justice, as an Equivalent for so great a Debt as the Eternal Punishment of all Mankind in Hell-Fire. We judg it better thus to speak, than as our Opposers do, because the Abolition of our Sins, and our Discharge from Punishment, is always in Holy Scripture attributed to the great Mercy and Goodness of God ;

'tis called Pardon, Remission, Grace, Freedom of Grace, Riches of Grace ; all which were false, if indeed the Lord Christ gave a just Equivalent (they say, more than an Equivalent) to God's Justice for us.

In a word, our Opposers and We agree, that the Lord Christ, being to die upon other accounts, did withal tender his Person in Quality of an Expiatory Sacrifice, for the Sins of Mankind ; himself was the Offerer, and also the Victim, and his Cross the Altar ; he was a Ransom, and a Price of Redemption for us : but in this we differ, Whether he was an Adequate Price, or a Sacrifice to the Justice of God ? We cannot comprehend that one Man could be an Equivalent for all Men ; or his short Sufferings equal to the Eternal Damnation of an Infinite Multitude ; or that God can be said to pardon, if he hath been over-paid for our Debt to him : therefore we content our selves to teach, that our Blessed Saviour being to confirm his Gospel by his Death, and to be made perfect by Sufferings, as the Author to the Hebrews speaks, did also offer himself as a Sacrifice, and as a sort of Ransom and Price for us, to that Mercy and Benignity of God, by which he was wont to accept the Oblation of Beasts, the Blood of Goats and Lambs, for his repenting and returning People. This Hypothesis leaves to God the intire Glory of forgiving us ; to our Saviour, the Honour of being the Means, Motive and Procurer of our Pardon and Salvation ; and fully answers all Scripture-Expressions concerning our Saviour's Death, objected to us by our Opposers in this Question. But they (our Opposers) after all their Subterfuges, are forced by their Hypothesis, to this monstrous Conclusion ; that God freely pardoneth to Sinners their whole Debt of Sin and Punishment ; and yet has been infinitely over-paid for both, in the Death and other Sufferings of the Lord Christ : than which, there can be no greater, or more apparent Contradiction.

As to our Author's Conclusion, that he wishes himself *accused*, and again *accused*, if ever

ever he deliver other Doctrine than what he hath defended in this Book : I shall only say this, that *as wise as he have lived to alter their Minds*. Nor can he defend his Rashness by the Example of the Apostle; for when St. Paul curses himself or any other for preaching or teaching otherways, he speaks not of doubtful and uncertain Questions; but *if we preach any other GOSPEL to you, let us be accursed; Gal. i. 8, 9.* And the reason of our Apostle's Confidence was very different from

our Author's: the latter grounds himself on a few ambiguous and uncertain Texts, capable of contrary Translations and Senses; and when taken in *his* Sense of them, are contrary to Reason and common Sense, and to the general Current of Holy Scripture: but the Apostle speaks of a matter which he had received by *express* Revelation from Jesus Christ, and even from God the Father of All.

F I N I S.

BOOKS lately printed by the Socinians.

THE Brief History of the Unitarians, vulgarly called Socinians, in four Letters. The first Letter, besides the History of the Socinians, proves the Unity of God: the other three answer the (pretended) Proofs of the Doctrine of the Trinity. Second Edition.

The Acts of *Athanasius*, with *brief Notes on his Creed*, and Observations on Dr. *Sherlock's* Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, opposed by him to the *Brief History* and *Brief Notes*.

Observations on Dr. *Wallis* his Letters, written in Vindication and Explication of the Athanasian Creed.

Some Thoughts on Dr. *Sherlock's* Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

A Defence of the brief History, against the Vindication by Dr. *Sherlock*.

An Exhortation to a Free and Impartial Inquiry into the Doctrines of Religion.

A Letter of Resolution concerning the Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation; giving the general Reasons of the Unitarians against those Doctrines.

Two Letters touching the Trinity and Incarnation; the first urges the Belief of the Athanasian Creed, the other is an Answer thereto.

An accurate Examination or Judgment on the principal Texts relating to the Questions concerning the Divinity of our Saviour, and his Satisfaction; occasioned by a Book of Mr. L. *Milbourn's*, called by him, *Mysteries*. (in Religion) vindicated.